

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV

**SPEECHES AND INTERVIEWS
ON WORLD PROBLEMS
1957**



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
Moscow 1958

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN

This book comprises records of the interviews granted by N S Khrushchov to foreign news correspondents in 1957 and those of Khrushchov's speeches dealing with problems of Soviet foreign policy and international relations

The material included in the book was published earlier in the Soviet press.

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Answers to Questions Put by the Editors of <i>Rude Pravo</i>	7
Answer to the Question Put by the Correspondent of <i>l'Humanité</i>	14
Speech at a Reception at the Embassy of the Chinese People's Republic in Honour of a Chinese Government Delegation, January 17, 1957	16
Speech at a Reception at the Embassy of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, February 18, 1957	20
Answers to Questions Put by the Editors of <i>Grand Rapids Herald</i>	28
Speech at a Reception at the Embassy of the People's Republic of Albania, April 15, 1957	31
Speech at a Reception at the Embassy of the Polish People's Republic, April 19, 1957	38
Interview Given to Turner Catledge, Editor-in-Chief of <i>The New York Times</i> , May 10, 1957	44
Interview Given to CBS Correspondents, May 28, 1957	60
Speech at a Soviet-Finnish Friendship Meeting in Helsinki, June 8, 1957	78
Statement at a Press Conference in Helsinki, June 13, 1957	85
Speech at a Meeting of Welcome in Moscow upon Return from Finland, June 14, 1957	93
Interview Given to Tomoo Hirooka, Editor-in-Chief of the <i>Asahi Shimbun</i> , June 18, 1957 (Transcript)	97
Speech at a Soviet-Czechoslovak Friendship Meeting in Ostrava during Visit of Soviet Party and Government Delegation to Czechoslovakia, July 13, 1957	125

	<i>Page</i>
Speech at a Meeting of the Working People of Prague during Visit of Soviet Party and Government Delegation to Czecho- slovakia, July 16, 1957	135
Speech at a Soviet-Czechoslovak Friendship Meeting of the Working People of Moscow, July 16, 1957	144
Address Delivered in the People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic during Visit of Soviet Party and Gov- ernment Delegation to G.D.R, August 8, 1957	152
Speech at a Meeting of the Working People of Leipzig during Visit of Soviet Party and Government Delegation to G.D.R, August 9, 1957	172
Speech at a Meeting of the Working People of Berlin during Visit of Soviet Party and Government Delegation to G.D.R, August 13, 1957	180
Speech at a Meeting of the Working People of Moscow upon Return of Soviet Party and Government Delegation from G.D.R, August 14, 1957	194
Answers to Questions Put by J Reston, <i>New York Times</i> Chief Diplomatic Correspondent, October 7, 1957	199
Answers to Questions Put by P Dampson, Correspondent of <i>The Toronto Telegram</i> , Canada	227
International Significance of the October Revolution The Growth of the Forces of World Socialism From the Report "Forty Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution" to the Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R, November 6, 1957	239
Interview Given to Henry Shapiro, Correspondent of American United Press, November 14, 1957	261
Interview Given to Muhammad Hassanein Haikal, Editor-in-Chief of the Egyptian Newspaper <i>Al Ahram</i> , November 18, 1957.	283
Answers to Questions Put by Brazilian Journalists Victorio Mar- torelli and Tito Fleury, November 21, 1957	294
Interview Given to W R Hearst, November 22, 1957	303
N S Khrushchov's Reply to an Open Letter by the British Philosopher, Bertrand Russell	336
N S Khrushchov's Reply to the Letter by Bertrand Russell	340

	<i>Page</i>
Interview Given to E' Pickering, Editor-in-Chief of <i>Daily Express</i> , December 19, 1957	348
Speech at the Ninth Session of the U S S R Supreme Soviet (Fourth Convocation), December 21, 1957	360
For Peace and Happiness of Nations!	
To Readers of the Journal " <i>Soviet-Chinese Friendship</i> "	386

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
PUT BY THE EDITORS
OF *RUDE PRAVO***

The Editor-in-Chief of the Czechoslovak Communist Party paper *Rude Pravo*, Vladimír Koucky, addressed a number of questions to N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the C.C., C.P.S.U.

The questions and N. S. Khrushchov's answers are as follows

Question: The decisions of the Twentieth C.P.S.U. Congress clearly state that the popular masses are sufficiently strong to prevent war and secure a brighter future in conditions of peaceful development. Mankind made undoubted progress in this respect in the past year by repelling the aggression in Egypt and the attempts to re-establish the reactionary, fascist regime in Hungary.

What, in your opinion, are the immediate tasks in the struggle to relax international tension and secure durable peace throughout the world?

Answer: The events of 1956 convincingly demonstrated that the struggle to maintain and consolidate peace is the cardinal task of our time. Expressed in this struggle are the vital interests of the nations.

We know that, thanks to the efforts of the peace-loving states, international tension was considerably lessened. However, this trend was clearly not to the liking of the bellicose elements in the Western countries who are in-

terested in continuing the cold war and inciting hatred among the nations, so that the capitalist monopolies could more easily continue the arms drive and amass the fabulous profits it brings them.

That is why the reactionaries decided to aggravate the international situation. This found expression in the Anglo-French-Israeli aggressive attack on Egypt and in the counter-revolutionary, fascist conspiracy against people's democracy in Hungary. The danger of another world war was thus suddenly and sharply increased. But both of these ventures ended in failure.

Why did the imperialists fail in carrying out their plans? Primarily because the forces working for peace are now sufficiently powerful to bridle the adventurists who, to further their own selfish ends, would plunge the nations into the calamity of another war.

It should now be clear to all that any attempt by the imperialists to unleash war, any attempt by the reactionary forces to encroach on the gains of the peoples of the socialist countries, will meet with a stern rebuff.

One of the most important lessons of the past year is that the people must heighten their vigilance against the designs of the imperialist aggressors and resolutely advance the struggle for peace. In 1957 the forces standing for peace will no doubt become stronger still, and this will considerably help to improve the international situation.

Reduction of armaments and armed forces and prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons would, in my opinion, now be of vast importance in easing international tension and strengthening world peace. Cessation of the arms race would strengthen international confidence, and reduction of the immense armaments expenditure would raise national living standards.

The Soviet Government has repeatedly taken the initiative in disarmament and has submitted constructive suggestions towards this end. More, the Soviet Union has taken a number of practical steps in this direction by considera-

bly reducing its armed forces. The Czechoslovak Republic, the People's Republic of China and all the socialist countries play an active part in the effort to consolidate peace.

Establishment of a collective security system in Europe would go a long way towards removing international strain. Such a system undoubtedly accords with the vital interests of all the nations, for it would ensure the preservation of peace.

Maximum development of international economic and cultural ties based on the principles of equality was and remains an important factor in fostering greater confidence and mutual understanding between nations. Now as always, the Soviet Union favours broad, unhampered economic cooperation with all countries, without any discrimination whatever, and extension of cultural intercourse.

These, in my opinion, are some of the problems in the struggle to relax international tension and bring the world durable peace.

Question: The working people of all countries will this year celebrate a significant anniversary, the fortieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It will serve as a reminder to the Communist and Workers' parties of the need to rally still closer under the banner of Marxism-Leninism and to work with still greater vigour for firm international working-class unity.

What do you regard as the most important factor in the achievement of that goal?

Answer: In October 1917 the working class and the working people of our country, led by the great Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, destroyed the capitalist system and created a socialist state of workers and peasants. Colossal difficulties stood in the way of building the new society, but the Soviet people surmounted them and built socialism.

It can be said with full confidence that the whole course of international development since 1917, the movement of the nations along the path of progress, has been influenced by the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Following the peoples of the U.S.S.R., the peoples of the great land of China, Czechoslovakia and a number of other European and Asian countries set foot on the socialist path. The great commonwealth of socialist countries which make up the world socialist system arose and has since been gaining strength. The leading and guiding force in these countries is the Communist and Workers' parties.

The victories of the working class and of the working people generally in the Soviet Union and in all the socialist countries were possible because the Communist and Workers' parties have in all their activities been unswervingly guided by Marxism-Leninism, the only correct teaching of the proletariat.

It is under the banner of Marxism-Leninism that the Communist parties of France, Italy and other countries are waging an irreconcilable struggle for the cause of the working class and all the working people.

That is precisely why the enemies of socialism concentrate their fire on the revolutionary parties, and primarily on the parties in countries where the victorious working class is in power, where socialism has been or is being built.

In their attempts to sow discord in the communist movement and weaken the unity of the Communist and Workers' parties, the enemies of the working class resort to every conceivable deception. So-called "national communism" is being especially widely advertised; the universal factors produced by the October Revolution—factors that are necessary for the successful transition from capitalism to socialism—are contrasted to specific national features in the socialist development of individual countries. It stands to reason that in each country there are specific features, determined by national and historical conditions, in the struggle for the victory of proletarian dictatorship and in the building of socialism. However, these specific features, no matter of what nature, cannot cancel the basic laws governing socialist revolution. A one-sided approach, the tendency to give prominence to national peculiarities, to

"special paths" to socialism in one or another country, is injurious to the building of socialism in the given country and to the commonwealth of socialist countries as a whole.

The task is to heighten vigilance with regard to the designs of the enemies of socialism, resolutely to repel every attempt to undermine the foundations of the unity of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist and Workers' parties. There must also be vigilance in respect to those who, parading as friends and fighters for socialism, are working to sow division in the socialist ranks, thus playing, whether they wish it or not, into the hands of the imperialists, who are seeking to disorganize the revolutionary forces.

We must be keenly alive to our momentous responsibility and mobilize our forces to strengthen the Communist and Workers' parties, strengthen proletarian solidarity and the unity of our ranks, cement the unity of the international labour movement and be faithful to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the principles of proletarian internationalism, and to our battle slogan: "Workers of All Countries, Unite!"

Question: Recent events have emphasized anew the need for firm unity and the closest cooperation of the socialist countries on the principles set forth in the Soviet Government's Declaration of October 30, 1956.

What, in your opinion, are the chief tasks in strengthening this cooperation in 1957?

Answer: You are absolutely right in saying that recent events have served to emphasize, and very forcefully, the need for firm unity and the closest cooperation of the socialist countries. The principles set forth in the Soviet Government's Declaration of October 30, 1956, were and remain the fundamental basis for relations between the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries. Unfortunately, in the past these principles were at times violated, which, of course, could not but do damage to the friendship of the peoples of the socialist countries. This was exploited by hostile elements to inflate nationalistic sentiments and to weaken the unity of our countries.

The further strengthening of cooperation between the socialist countries requires unswerving observance of the Leninist principles of respect for the national interests of all nations, fraternal assistance to each other, and maximum development of amicable contacts, so that the people in each country tangibly feel the value of this cooperation

What is the source of the invincible vitality of the socialist countries? Their unity and solidarity, the strength of the socialist commonwealth. These are a guarantee of continued success for socialism. This great gain of the peoples must be safeguarded.

I would like to draw attention to the further extension of economic contacts between the socialist countries, which will make for a new advance in their economic development and raise the material standards of their working people. More extensive pooling of experience in industrial and agricultural management, in raising labour productivity and in practical application of scientific and technical achievements, would be of great value. The desire of the peoples of the socialist countries to build closer relations and know each other better is only natural. That is why it is important to extend and strengthen cultural exchange.

The existence of the capitalist camp, where the ruling classes, their parties and governments, are pursuing a policy directed against the socialist countries, cannot be disregarded by the latter in building their new life, in which there are neither exploiters nor exploited. That is why we must perfect the collective defence of the socialist countries and actively work in the international arena for the maintenance and consolidation of world peace.

Question: Events in the past months have demonstrated anew the unshakeable durability of Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship and brotherhood. Would you like to say a few words on the importance of this friendship for the peoples of the two countries and internationally?

Answer: The Soviet people highly prize the relations of sincere, fraternal friendship and comradeship which were

formed between our nations a long time ago. Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship was steeled, strengthened and made permanent in the war against German fascism and in the post-war period.

What is the basis of this friendship? The fundamental interests our peoples have in common, their common ideas and aims in the battle for socialism and communism, for world peace and human happiness, their profound mutual respect and trust. Our friendship is based on the noble principles of proletarian internationalism and is an example of a new type of relationship between socialist countries.

The strengthening of our friendship and brotherhood facilitates the economic and cultural development of our countries, enables us to help each other and learn from each other, and more successfully to overcome difficulties and advance. We believe that the Soviet people can learn from the Czechoslovaks, who have many outstanding achievements in economic and cultural development.

The peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union must solicitously safeguard and strengthen this friendship and protect it against enemy intrigue. We must be vigilant, always mindful of the fact that the German militarists are plotting revenge and building up the forces for new war ventures against our countries, against the European nations.

The peoples of Czechoslovakia can be confident that the Soviet people will always be their true and reliable friends.

Permit me, Comrade Editor, to convey through your militant newspaper, *Rude Pravo*, my best wishes to its readers—the industrious and gifted peoples of fraternal Czechoslovakia—to the glorious Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, for continued success in building their socialist state and in further raising the living standards of its working people.

A Happy New Year, dear comrades!

Pravda, January 1, 1957

**ANSWER TO THE QUESTION
PUT BY THE CORRESPONDENT
OF *L'HUMANITÉ***

The Moscow correspondent of *L'Humanité*, Pierre Hentgès, asked N. S. Khrushchov what New Year's wishes he would like to convey to the French working people.

The message follows.

Through your militant newspaper I should like to convey my best New Year's wishes to the workers of France and to the French people generally

The peoples of the Soviet Union and France are united by traditional ties of friendship, sealed by their joint struggle against a common enemy in two world wars. Now that the German militarists are staging a comeback and building up an army in preparation for fresh war gambles, the peoples of our two countries must unite their efforts still more to preserve and consolidate peace and security in Europe and the world.

The Soviet people have a deep feeling of fraternal solidarity with the working class and all the working people of France in their courageous fight for peace and democracy and for a brighter future for France. The many examples of determined resistance to the sinister forces of reaction and fascism set by the French workers have evoked the admiration of freedom-loving mankind. True to the spirit of proletarian internationalism and headed by its tried and tested leader, the Communist Party of France, the French

working class continues to march in the van of the fighters for freedom and socialism.

I am firmly convinced that the working class, labouring peasantry, progressive intellectuals and all French democrats will, by uniting their efforts, achieve success in the coming year in their struggle to prevent another destructive war, maintain and consolidate peace and assure France's social progress and national grandeur. The working people of France will always have most faithful friends in the peoples of the Soviet Union.

May 1957 see the strengthening of friendship and cooperation between our peoples!

A Happy New Year, dear friends!

Pravda, January 1, 1957

**SPEECH
AT A RECEPTION AT THE EMBASSY
OF THE CHINESE
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
IN HONOUR OF A CHINESE
GOVERNMENT DELEGATION**

January 17, 1957

Dear comrades and friends,

Our meeting today is a great occasion, which is reminiscent of a spring festival. It is a fine thing when people adhering to the same idea get together at a friendly meeting, speak frankly and cordially and feel that their thoughts coincide. I do not want to touch upon international imperialism, its plans and intrigues, although I am sure that that will surprise some people who will wonder how it happened that Khrushchov spoke without touching upon international imperialism. (*Animation in the hall. Applause.*) I must confess that I find it hard to do as a great effort is needed to keep clear of that subject. But our friendly meeting today is so delightful and joyous that I wish to avoid clouding it with talk about imperialism. (*Animation in the hall. Applause.*)

Of late, in the West, some people have been saying that we are "Stalinists," "followers of Stalin." In reply to that, we have stated more than once that in our minds the word "Stalinist," like Stalin himself, is inseparable from the great title of Communist. Where matters concerned the cause of the Revolution, the defence of the class interests of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle against our class enemies, Stalin courageously and uncompromisingly championed Marxism-Leninism. We did not criticize Stalin

for being a bad Communist. We criticized him for certain deviations, negative qualities, for committing grave mistakes. Lenin was the first to see these negative qualities. Vladimir Ilyich pointed out Stalin's shortcomings and mistakes. However, in the last period of his life, Stalin forgot Lenin's warnings. It is, of course, a bad thing that Stalin launched into deviations and mistakes which harmed our cause. But even when he committed mistakes and allowed the law to be broken, he did that with the full conviction that he was defending the gains of the Revolution, the cause of socialism. That was Stalin's tragedy. But in the fundamental, in the main thing—and for Marxist-Leninists the fundamental and main thing is the defence of the interests of the working class, the cause of socialism and the struggle against the enemies of Marxism-Leninism—in this fundamental and main thing, I, to use a popular expression, "would to goodness every Communist could fight as Stalin fought (*Stormy applause*)

The enemies of communism have deliberately invented the word "Stalinist" and are trying to make it sound abusive. For all of us, Marxist-Leninists, who have devoted our whole lives to the revolutionary struggle for the interests of the working class and its militant vanguard—the Party of Lenin—Stalin's name is inseparable from Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, each one of us, members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, strives to be as faithful to the cause of Marxism-Leninism, the struggle for the interests of the working class, as Stalin was faithful to this cause (*Applause.*)

The enemies of communism tried to snatch at our criticism of Stalin's shortcomings and mistakes, to utilize this criticism for their own ends. They wanted to direct the criticism of Stalin's personality cult against the foundations of our system, against the foundations of Marxism-Leninism, but nothing came or will ever come of that, gentlemen! You will never succeed in doing that much as you will never see your ears without a mirror. (*Laughter. Applause.*)

In doing honour to this meeting of the delegations of two great socialist powers, we have every ground for calling it a festival of spring, a festival of the consolidation and bloom of the unbreakable and eternal friendship between our fraternal peoples. This is a festival of great unity, because we have identical views and ideas and a common will to fight to the end for the triumph of the cause of the working class, for the triumph of socialism and communism, because we are guided by the teaching of Marxism-Leninism. That is mainly what establishes a kinship between the Soviet people and the Chinese people, between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China

Today, we greet the fraternal Communist Party of China, which is fighting for the triumph of Marxism-Leninism. (*Stormy applause.*) What does the triumph of Marxism-Leninism mean in our conception? Everybody knows that a competition is on in the world today between the socialist and capitalist systems. We are deeply convinced that in this competition socialism will win.

Frequently we have had to hear reproaches from the West in connection with our utterances about the inevitable downfall of the capitalist system. In particular, these reproaches were made in connection with some of my speeches. In saying that the capitalist system will crumble, we have never asserted nor do we assert that that will happen as a result of forcible measures by us. We are sure that it will leave the arena of history as a result of the struggle of internal forces much as perished the social formations that preceded it, that had their day and yielded to new social formations engendered by historical development. That is as inevitable as, for example, the death of a decrepit man, or a woman's confinement when it can no longer be prevented. The new comes into being, the old dies away. Naturally, through our work to establish socialism and communism in our countries, we will, to a certain extent, help

to hasten the triumph of the new. The force of example is a tremendous force. (*Stormy applause*)

I propose a toast to the fraternal Communist Party of China, to its leadership, to the Politbureau of its Central Committee, to Comrades Mao Tse-tung, Liu Shao-chi, Chou En-lai, Chu Teh, Chen Yun, Teng Hsiao-ping, He lung, to all the members of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China with whom we are advancing and shall continue to advance along the victorious path of Marxism-Leninism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

SPEECH
AT A RECEPTION AT THE EMBASSY
OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF BULGARIA

February 18, 1957

Dear Comrade Yugov,
Dear Comrade Zhivkov,

Dear comrades, members of the Government Delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and comrades accompanying the delegation, with all my heart I thank you for the warm and sincere things which Comrade Zhivkov and Comrade Yugov have said about the Soviet Union and about our people.

We extend a most hearty welcome to your delegation as envoys of the fraternal people of Bulgaria. The friendly relations between our peoples are of long standing. Many Bulgarians had been to Russia before the Revolution, and the word always used by our people when addressing them was the word "brother." This, evidently, dates from the times when Russians helped the people of Bulgaria in their liberation struggle against the foreign invaders.

What, then, can we say about the friendship between the peoples of our countries now that we are as one in the great and common cause of building socialism! I had the pleasure of being in Bulgaria in 1955 on an unofficial visit at the invitation of Comrade Vylko Chervenkov. I spent part of my vacation there. Together with the Bulgarian comrades I travelled extensively through the country and

everywhere saw the monuments to our glorious soldiers who fought for the liberation of Bulgaria. It was gratifying to see the love with which the working people of your country tend and treasure these monuments.

Dear comrades, we have no issues dividing the peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Bulgaria, no issues dividing our Communist Parties in their struggle for the victory of communism. It is gratifying and pleasing to note this. This is a sound guarantee for the further strengthening of genuinely friendly relations between the peoples and the Communist Parties of our countries.

Fraternal friendship is the greatest gain and happiness of our peoples. Unity of political views, unity of ideology of the socialist-camp countries, is the foundation of foundations. And it is here that the enemies of socialism direct their blows. They would very much like to shake the unity of the socialist countries, to divide them and then assail them one at a time. To this we can say to our ill-wishers: your efforts, gentlemen, are in vain!

We will firmly and consistently carry into life the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism, strengthen the fraternal friendship between the socialist countries and unswervingly pursue the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence of states with differing political systems. We want to live in peace and cooperate with all states irrespective of their social regimes, provided they, too, pursue a peaceful policy.

We are glad to cooperate with all states, big and small. Tiny rivulets and streams merge into the great rivers which carry their waters to the ocean. No matter how small a country may be, if its people and leaders pursue a peaceful policy, that country and that people deserve respect. Not only the voice of the big powers should be heeded, but also the voice of the small countries whose peoples fight for the consolidation of peace and security, for friendship among the nations.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Government is clear and simple. It is not associated with personalities; it is carried out by the Government on the basis of Leninist principles. This is perfectly understandable and requires no special explanation.

Comrades, the people of Bulgaria have been inspired and are inspired now by the glorious Communist Party of Bulgaria, of which Georgi Dimitrov, the great son of Bulgaria, was organizer and outstanding leader; for us, too, Georgi Dimitrov is an example of fearlessness, courage and staunchness. I do not know any other man who, looking death in the face, so heroically upheld the great ideas of communism and from accused became the accuser. Such courage is found only in a man who is devoted heart and soul to the working class, who is convinced of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, to the triumph of which he dedicated the whole of his splendid life (*Applause.*)

Just now, together with the representatives of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, we are celebrating in friendly fashion. I believe that our meetings and talks will yield good results.

Not long ago we received in Moscow Comrades Chou En-lai, He Lung and other envoys of great China; Comrades Gomulka, Zawadzki, Cyrankiewicz and other leaders of the Polish Republic; Comrades Zapotocky, Široky and Novotny, leaders of the Czechoslovak people, a delegation from the Rumanian People's Republic, led by Comrade Chivu Stoica; a Government Delegation from the German Democratic Republic, composed of Otto Grotewohl, Waller Ulbricht and other leaders of the G.D.R. Government and Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party. Now we are hosts to a Government Delegation from the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

Our countries comprise a single socialist camp; we are united by the common effort for the cause of socialism, for peace and the security of nations. Naturally, the bourgeois

governments entertain no sympathy for us, for the socialist countries. But the socialist and capitalist countries live on the same planet, and for the sake of peace between nations it is necessary to pursue a policy of peaceful co-existence, to subordinate emotions to common sense.

The capitalists do not conceal the fact that they are spending millions, and they are actually spending hundreds of millions, of dollars on subversion, espionage and sabotage against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They are spending thousands of millions of dollars on armaments and on military bases in foreign territories. Should we just smile and pretend that we are oblivious of this? Not at all. We are aware of all the machinations of the enemies and we are taking the necessary measures so that the enemies will not take us by surprise. We, the socialist countries, however, base our relations with other states on a peaceful policy and pursue it unswervingly and consistently. We do not want war and have no intention of attacking anyone. But should we be attacked, we will defend ourselves, and when we do so the attackers will have difficulty in defending themselves. (*Stormy applause.*)

That is our line, clear and firm

You, comrades, know that 39 years have passed since our Party, led by Lenin, assumed power and established the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country. What did our enemies say in those days? They declared that in a week everything would go to pieces. But the months passed and the Soviet land stood firm, building its new life. Then they began to say that within a year, not more, the Soviet state would cease to exist, and the old system would be re-established. But the years and the decades rolled on and the rule of the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union grew stronger and stronger. Led by their Communist Party, the Soviet people built the new life and established socialist society, a thing unprecedented in history, a society without parasites and idlers, without

exploiting classes. What was there left for the capitalist gentlemen to do? They began to assert that the Soviet Union was a colossus with feet of clay; a slight push and it would collapse. They then began to trumpet throughout the world that if Hitler Germany attacked the Soviet Union, the fascist troops would overrun our country as easily as a knife cuts butter. How were the predictions fulfilled? The Soviet Union stands and will stand firmly throughout the ages, while the Hitler fascist empire was shattered and Hitler himself has long since rotted in his grave.

Not long ago the imperialist forces tried to probe us by organizing a counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary. But here, too, they failed to accomplish their nefarious end. The people of Hungary proved to be staunch. All the fraternal peoples came to their aid. We have said, and we say now, that we never have abandoned and never will abandon our friends in trouble, we will always defend the interests of the socialist countries and give our friends a helping hand if the need arises (*Stormy applause*)

In doing so we are fulfilling our proletarian internationalist duty. We say this frankly, aware that for some it is pleasant, for others not. But it is always like that: what is pleasant for some is unpleasant for others, what is good for the workers is bad for the bourgeoisie.

And no matter how unpleasant it may be for the imperialists, life in Hungary is becoming normal; the Hungarian working people have recoiled from the frightful path to which imperialist reaction impelled them, they have realized that their happiness lies in the family of the socialist peoples, that the Horthy fascist forces gambled with their destiny, seeking to shackle them once more. The Soviet troops who, at the request of the Hungarian Government, came to the aid of the working people of Hungary, carried out their duty with honour. The counter-revolutionary uprising was crushed, the Soviet Army helped the Hungarian people to quell the counter-revolution and pre-

vented a highly dangerous hotbed of imperialist reaction and war from arising in the heart of Europe (*Applause.*)

After the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, bourgeois prophets asserted that the socialist camp was about to split asunder. The starveling always dreams of food, and the bourgeoisie dream of the disintegration of the unity of our countries. We have to disappoint the capitalist gentlemen. Quite the contrary, the fraternal cooperation of the socialist countries has become stronger. In the course of the Hungarian events everything passed through fire. All the refuse was consumed in the flames and went up the chimney, while everything valuable and durable, all that links the fraternal parties, grew stronger, was welded and tempered.

Unity of our peoples is the foundation of foundations for which we must work, that and the purity of Marxist-Leninist teaching. In these matters we must be inflexible and irreconcilable. Ideology is our strongest weapon. We cannot let the working class be disarmed ideologically.

All our fraternal Communist and Workers' parties realize this. And to those who don't, this truth should be explained. To those who try to undermine the unity of the socialist countries we must retaliate with three blows for one. In the fight for the unity of the socialist-camp countries, our forces should be steeled. Our cause is invincible. (*Applause.*)

Our opponents allege that the Soviet Union maintains unequal relations with the other socialist countries. Is there any need to refute this?

The relations that have evolved between the socialist countries are of a new type. Such relations have never existed, nor can they exist, between capitalist countries. It goes without saying, that in the relations between our countries certain difficulties did arise, and may arise again, but they were always overcome and will continue to be overcome by way of sincere friendship and fraternity, in the interests of all the countries of the socialist camp.

The Soviet Union builds its relations with states in a way that is not detrimental to other states. In the socialist camp these relations derive from fraternal mutual aid, as in a close-knit family, where brother helps brother. It is a pleasure to help when the help benefits the fraternal people, when it furthers the economic advancement of a country which is working to strengthen the common camp of the socialist states. That is the main thing, comrades (*Applause.*) That has been and will continue to be our standpoint.

We must help one another and use the achievements of each of the socialist countries in the interests of our common cause. The working class of the Soviet Union has rich experience because it won power and set about building the new life earlier than the others. I have no desire whatever to convince those who try to minimize the significance of the Soviet Union's experience. And it is just because the Soviet Union has this rich experience in socialist construction, because it is the most powerful country in the socialist camp that the imperialists direct their main blow against the Soviet Union. But if we, all the socialist countries, strengthen and develop our commonwealth, firmly pursue the Leninist policy, we shall go straight ahead to the complete victory of communism (*Prolonged applause*.)

Our Party has condemned the mistakes and distortions associated with the Stalin personality cult. It has done so of its own accord as a strong party; no one forced us and no one urged us to do so. The Party has condemned these mistakes proceeding from the standpoint of principle, motivated by the desire to forge ahead still more rapidly with the building of communism. The peoples of our country understood, approved and supported the Leninist policy of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Our Party has criticized Stalin for mistakes and shortcomings which Lenin vigorously denounced and which became particularly manifest in the last years of Stalin's life.

But Stalin, with whom we worked, was an outstanding revolutionary. Following the Lenin path, the Party routed the enemies of socialism, rallied our people, and established a powerful socialist state. The Soviet people waged a grim struggle against German fascism and smashed it, upheld the great gains of the socialist revolution and saved the peoples from the danger of fascist enslavement. This great victory was won under the leadership of our Party and its Central Committee which was headed by Comrade Stalin (*Applause.*)

Stalin loyally served the interests of the working class, the cause of Marxism-Leninism, and we will not give up Stalin to the enemies. (*Applause.*)

The socialist countries, headed by their Communist and Workers' parties, are growing and gaining in strength. Allow me to toast the triumph of our common cause, the cause of the entire socialist camp which unites 900,000,000 people.

Our cause will triumph. Ours is a just cause. I toast its victory! (*Stormy applause*)

To the fraternal Communist Party of Bulgaria and its Central Committee, to its First Secretary, Comrade Todor Zhivkov!

To the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Comrade Anton Yugov!

To all the members of the Government Delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria! (*Stormy applause.*)

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
PUT BY THE EDITORS
OF *GRAND RAPIDS HERALD***

The editorial board of the American newspaper *Grand Rapids Herald* submitted a number of questions to N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. Below are given the questions and N. S. Khrushchov's answers.

Question: The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the United States is preparing for a nuclear war. Does this mean that you, as First Secretary of the Communist Party, taking into consideration your assessment of the ideological contradictions between the Soviet Union and the United States, regard war as inevitable?

Answer: I should like to emphasize, first of all, that statements on preparations in the U.S.A. for a nuclear war are made in the United States itself. Some military and political leaders in America make statements of this kind quite openly. It is also known that the U.S. Government obstinately refuses to conclude an agreement banning atomic and hydrogen weapons, as suggested by the Soviet Union.

Does this mean that war is inevitable? No, certainly not. We believe that war is not a fatalistic inevitability. The recent events in Egypt have reaffirmed that the forces standing for maintenance of peace can curb the aggressors and avert war.

Maintenance and strengthening of peace depend, of course, primarily on the policy of the Great Powers. As for the

Soviet Union, we proceed from the historical fact that there are both capitalist and socialist countries in the world. Although they differ in social system and ideology, everyday life confirms the necessity of peaceful relations between them. Following the teaching of Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, we stand for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. The Soviet Union, furthermore, seeks in mutual interest to develop business and cultural contacts with all countries including the United States, for, in our opinion, such contacts would tend towards the establishment of normal relations and increased confidence between the countries.

Should the Western powers, and the United States in the first instance, likewise adhere to the principle of peaceful coexistence, then it can be said with certainty that peace will be maintained and strengthened.

Question: Has there been any period in the last 11 years when the Soviet Union felt that the danger of war was especially great?

Answer. The danger of the outbreak of armed conflicts arises from the fact that for years the Western powers have been pursuing a policy of arms drive, the "positions of strength" policy. It will be recalled that prominent American leaders are on record as saying that in the past this policy brought the world more than once "to the brink of war."

It is known, however, that when the "positions of strength" policy was laid aside and replaced by the method of negotiation, dangerous hotbeds of war in Korea and in Indo-China, for instance, were extinguished. When the Heads of Government of the four Great Powers met in Geneva in the summer of 1955, the world witnessed a certain relaxation of international tension. Unfortunately, this period did not last long. The attack on Egypt and the subsequent attempts by some powers to fill the "vacuum" that had allegedly formed in the Arab East again greatly aggra-

vated the international situation, creating a grave threat to peace in that area.

There can be no doubt that here, too, a settlement of the outstanding issues can be achieved solely by the method of negotiations between all parties concerned.

Question: Which aspects in the relations between our two countries, in your opinion, constitute the greatest threat to peace?

Answer Clearly, peace is gravely endangered by the United States "positions of strength" policy in all its aspects—rejection of disarmament, the arms drive, the forming of military blocs and building of bases in other countries, remilitarization of Western Germany, the attempts to meddle in the internal affairs of other countries, to impede international trade, economic and cultural contacts.

A policy of this kind, obviously, does not chime with the task of easing international tension and normalizing relations between states

We stand for relaxing international tension and improving Soviet-American relations, believing that this corresponds to the interests both of the Soviet and the American peoples. These considerations prompted us to propose to the Government of the United States in January 1956 that a treaty of friendship and cooperation be signed between our countries. Unfortunately, this step by the Soviet Union and a number of other Soviet proposals for improving relations between the U S S R. and the United States have not yet met with a positive attitude on the part of the American Government

There can be no doubt that if both countries manifest readiness to work for an adjustment of relations between the U.S S R. and the United States and exert necessary efforts in this direction, then Soviet-American relations could be improved and this, in turn, would react favourably on the entire international situation.

Pravda, March 19, 1957

**SPEECH
AT A RECEPTION AT THE EMBASSY
OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF ALBANIA**

April 15, 1957

Dear Comrade Mehmet Shehu,
Dear Comrade Enver Hoxha,

Allow me to thank you for the kind words you have addressed to the Soviet Union and our Communist Party. We express our gratitude for your warm words about the policy of the Soviet Government and our Party, for the high appreciation which you give our policy, our friendly relations with fraternal Albania.

On our part we are exerting and shall continue to exert every effort to broaden and strengthen our friendship with the courageous and freedom-loving people of Albania who are building socialism under the leadership of their tried Party of Labour.

We fully subscribe to your statement that not only is there virtually not a single contradiction between our countries, our peoples and our Parties, but that there is also not the slightest diversity between us in questions of state, economic, Party and ideological relations, in problems of international policy. We are happy to note that in all these questions our points of view fully coincide.

It is very pleasant to note that and we express the firm conviction that such fraternal relations will continue to develop and will promote deep understanding between our

socialist countries and further strengthen our friendly relations.

As we consolidate friendship between our countries in every possible way, we must do all we can to help extend and strengthen friendly relations among all socialist countries and increase the might of our great socialist camp.

Some leaders express their disagreement with the very concept of socialist camp and want to replace the term "socialist camp" with the word "cooperation" or some other similar word. I doubt if there is a more precise definition than the term "socialist camp," which best expresses the essence of the relations among socialist countries in a world where two systems—the socialist and the capitalist—exist. There will inevitably be two opposite camps as long as there are two systems representing two opposite poles. Therefore, we must continue strengthening our position and consolidating friendship among socialist countries and the unity of our socialist camp.

The development of friendship and cooperation between countries building socialism sometimes encounters difficulties. We must soberly evaluate these difficulties and doggedly surmount them. In this respect, I should like to say a few words about the relations of our countries with the fraternal people of Yugoslavia.

A few years ago, relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia seriously deteriorated. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government have done and are doing all they can constantly to improve these relations along the line of both the Government and the Party.

At present, in the relations between Albania and Yugoslavia there are greater difficulties than in the relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. We sincerely hope that these difficulties are surmounted and that good-neighbour, friendly relations are established between your countries.

Naturally, that requires time, common striving and persistence. To achieve full understanding and to strengthen

friendship on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles, much persevering work, particularly to overcome difficulties in questions of ideology, will have to be done. And that must be done. Attention must be centred not on emphasizing divergences of our points of view in one question or another, but on that which draws the peoples of our countries together in their struggle for socialism, for lasting peace. I think that if we proceed from these positions, much of what still clouds our relations with Yugoslavia will disperse. I am an optimist and want to believe that that can be achieved where there is mutual desire for it. We are sure that in this question, too, there is complete unanimity between us and you, our dear Albanian friends. We hope that that is the desire of the people and the leadership of Yugoslavia.

In all its activities, our Communist Party, founded and steeled by the great Lenin, is guided by the teaching of Marxism-Leninism. It resolutely repulses all the intrigues of the enemies of socialism and never stays in debt when we are attacked.

Events have recently taken place which have heightened tension in international relations. Towards the close of last year an acute situation arose in Hungary, where counter-revolutionary forces made an attempt to overthrow the people's power. The situation in Hungary was quite hot, in fact, as hot as Hungarian pepper. But the designs of the counter-revolution and of international reaction were frustrated.

International events aggravated still further as a result of the imperialist aggression in Egypt. But there, too, the imperialists miscalculated and met a worthy rebuff. Although passions have still not been allayed, they have noticeably calmed down and life is entering into its normal run. We must bend every effort to relax international tension, achieve an improvement in relations among all countries and consolidate peace throughout the world.

We want firm unity and friendship among the peoples of the socialist countries not to the detriment of our relations with the capitalist countries, both with our close neighbours

and with all the other countries, which, though they do not have common frontiers with us, nevertheless exist on the globe. In our relations with capitalist countries, we steadfastly adhere to Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence.

Messrs. the capitalists raise a hue and cry, saying that while proclaiming a policy of peaceful coexistence we at the same time speak of the struggle between communist and bourgeois ideologies. Yes, such a struggle is going on and it expresses the interests of different classes. And that is quite in order. The capitalists have their own views, their own convictions and their own way of evaluating events. They are doing all in their power to defend private ownership of the means of production, they are against communism. We Communists have our own views, our own convictions. We are against private ownership of the means of production, we are building a new life on socialist principles and are upholding the ideas of communism. But both the capitalist and socialist countries are on one planet and they have nowhere to go from this planet. That means that they have to coexist, to fashion peaceful relations.

The imperialists are blaming us for having created the Warsaw pact. Yes, that pact exists between the socialist countries. But it is common knowledge that it was concluded as a result of an aggravation of international relations, as a result of the formation by the imperialist countries of aggressive alliances and blocs like NATO, SEATO, the Baghdad bloc and so forth. Here, beside us, is the Norwegian Ambassador Mr Braadland. Look what a likeable man he is. He represents a neighbouring country which is a member of NATO. Account must be taken of that, it cannot be helped. M. Dejean, the Ambassador of France, is also here. He represents a country whose ruling circles hand in hand with the governments of Britain and Israel organized aggression against Egypt. They tried to subordinate Egypt by force of arms, but nothing came of that and they had to clear out. We were very distressed when war was unleashed against Egypt and were happy when that war was stopped.

Latterly, international events have shown that the forces of peace are resolutely coming out against all attempts to start another war. The peoples are advocating peaceful coexistence. On our part, we shall continue doing everything we can to promote healthy relations among all countries so that each people can live as its conscience dictates, so that a situation should arise where there would be no NATO, SEATO, Baghdad bloc or Warsaw Treaty.

The capitalists like capitalist orders. And we take account of that fact. In the socialist countries, where the power is wielded by the people, there are different, socialist orders. That, too, cannot be discounted. Do not hinder us from building socialism.

We shall never take up arms to force the ideas of communism upon anybody. We do not need to do that, for the ideas of communism express the vital interests of the popular masses. Our ideas, the ideas of communism, have such great vitality that no weapon can destroy them, that not even the nuclear weapon can hold up the development of these progressive ideas. Our ideas will capture the minds of mankind. The attempts of the imperialists to arrest the spread of the ideas of communism by force of arms are doomed to failure. That is shown by numerous lessons of history.

Call to mind how attempts of this kind by international imperialism against our Soviet land ended. Or call to mind how the efforts of the American imperialists ended with respect to the liberation struggle of the great Chinese people. In their fight against the Chinese people, the American imperialists counted chiefly on Chiang Kai-shek. They stinted neither strength nor means, put up 6,000 million dollars to support the clique headed by Chiang Kai-shek, armed him with tanks, artillery and aircraft. But all their designs were defeated. The Chinese people, led by their Communist Party which was armed with the progressive ideas of communism, won a great victory and took the path of socialist development. As regards the American arms,

they passed to the people's power headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

History teaches that in our day a people fighting for liberation cannot be made by force of arms to accept orders it does not want. If Messrs. the capitalists are thinking of helping the backward countries, as is constantly and loudly noised abroad, let them do it, only without war, without interfering in the internal affairs of the peoples of these countries. But the peoples of underdeveloped countries must bear in mind that capitalists do not give something for nothing, as that is in contradiction to the very essence of capitalism.

The Americans now are lauding the so-called Eisenhower doctrine in every possible way and are seeking to impose it on the peoples of the Middle East who are fighting for independence. And in so doing, they make no effort at all to ask the peoples of these countries about their attitude to the Eisenhower doctrine. Yet, it is the peoples themselves who should have the final say, because this concerns their destiny, their future.

The countries of our socialist camp, united by a single aim, by unshakeable fraternal friendship, are strong both ideologically and materially. We have the armed forces necessary to defend our socialist gains and protect the peaceful labour of our peoples. But we have frequently declared and again repeat that we are ready on mutually reasonable principles to disarm on a still larger scale. We consistently call for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, for the cessation of the testing of these weapons, for the implementation of all measures necessary for complete disarmament. We are ready to do everything reasonable that conforms with the interests of peace-loving nations and the consolidation of peace the world over. And if the advocates of NATO are not prepared to implement far-reaching measures on disarmament, let us move in that direction step by step. I am confident that the time will come when our just struggle for peace will triumph and the peace-loving peoples will achieve their goal.

Some people say that when Khrushchov speaks of co-existence he invariably adds that capitalism will perish and that communism will ultimately triumph. To this I can reply that for forty years now Messrs. the capitalists have been reiterating that the cause of communism, started by the Soviet Union, will fail and that private ownership will triumph in our country. They say that private ownership is omnipotent. We affirm that the ideas of communism are incomparably stronger, that these ideas will ultimately prevail. Therefore, we repeat again and again: let us compete, let us coexist peacefully.

In this profound conviction of ours, we have an undivided common point of view with you, our dear Albanian friends, and with all the peoples of the countries of the socialist camp. I think that the Yugoslav comrades, too, share this point of view.

We also know that in the capitalist countries as well there are many honest people who sincerely want peaceful coexistence, the development of friendly relations with all countries.

Allow me to propose a toast to the health of our dear Albanian friends, to the health of comrades Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu, to the health of all the members of the Government and Party Delegation from the People's Republic of Albania, to further successes by the fraternal people of Albania and the Albanian Party of Labour.

To further successes in the development of fraternal friendship among the socialist countries, to further successes in the implementation of the policy of peaceful co-existence of all countries, to the consolidation of peace throughout the world!

(N. S. Khrushchov's speech was frequently interrupted by applause.)

**SPEECH
AT A RECEPTION AT THE EMBASSY
OF THE POLISH
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC**

April 19, 1957

Dear Comrade Cyrankiewicz,

Dear comrades and friends,

I greet you on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government. We listened to your speech with great satisfaction. My friends and I fully concur with what you have said.

It is particularly pleasant to note that in your speech you stressed the necessity for solidarity among the socialist countries. We have never had any doubts on that score. The socialist countries will do all in their power to continue strengthening friendly relations among themselves.

There were certain divergences in the relations between our countries, and the enemies of communism sought to use them for their own ends to the detriment of Polish-Soviet relations. In so doing, they proceeded from their own class, ideological positions. That was natural.

In capitalist or, to be more exact, in imperialist countries there were many insidious calculations about Polish-Soviet relations. Some imperialist circles would like to change these relations, to cause them to deteriorate. But while Messrs. the imperialists pursue these aims, we, on the contrary, want to strengthen genuinely socialist relations between our countries.

In the relations between our countries there have been different periods. There have been times when shoulder to shoulder we fought common enemies. There have been times when our troops came to Poland as invaders. And there have also been times when Polish troops invaded our territory. But all that belongs to the past, to history. Some people are fanning this past and would like to warm their unclean hands over it.

We live in a new age, in an epoch of new history. Relations of fraternal friendship have been set up between our countries. Today, your people have no greater and no stauncher friends than the peoples of the socialist countries.

Comrade Cyrankiewicz and his party have come to us on their way from great people's China. We love China not because she is great for the number of her population, but because she is great for her ideas and deeds, for her identity of views with us in the upbuilding of socialism, in the struggle for peace and friendship among the nations.

In Moscow, we have just had a Government and Party Delegation from the People's Republic of Albania. In the socialist camp, China has the biggest population and Albania—the smallest. But both the one and the other are building socialism in the united family of the socialist commonwealth. Our relations with the one and the other are founded on principles of mutual aid and cooperation. Precisely therein lies socialist equality. Had we pursued any other policy, we would not have been Communists! We support people's China. We also support people's Albania. Precisely that is our policy.

We should like to build up our relations with non-socialist countries on principles of equality as well. But that does not depend on us alone. We cannot forcefully impose such relations. We must take reality into account.

Hitches may arise in the relations between socialist countries as well, because the relations shaping between them are new and have no parallel in history. And that is

no easy thing, inasmuch as behind us we have a heavy burden of the past and, besides, there are forces which are hindering and will go on hindering the new relations that have taken shape and are developing between socialist countries.

The falsehoods being spread by bourgeois journalists cannot, of course, influence our relations. It can be said of these fabrications that they are like the fly which tries to bite an elephant. But can a fly do anything to harm an elephant?

We shall consolidate our friendship with the Polish people. The Poles are our neighbours. We have quite a few common enemies. We are united by common interests of socialist upbuilding, by all that concerns the defence of the peace and security of our countries. The border running along the Oder and the Neisse is a border of peace, it is your frontier and ours. If anybody crosses your frontier, that will be a threat not only to you but also to the security of the Soviet Union.

Therefore, we should like to warn our enemies: do not play with us, do not try us with provocative putsches of the kind organized in Hungary. Today there is talk in the foreign press about organizing a similar putsch in the German Democratic Republic. See that you don't miscalculate. We are quite able to give a rap on the knuckles. Our German friends from the German Democratic Republic, our friends—Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Albanians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, our friends the Chinese, all our friends may rely on the Soviet Union just as we rely on them. That is precisely what friendship is—all for one and one for all.

Poland is today being courted like a marriageable girl. Why? Because they hope that something may come of it. They want to find forces in Poland which could be used against the people's power and the establishment of socialism in Poland, against the Soviet Union. They are aiming their chief blows against the Soviet Union because it was the first in the world to raise the revolutionary

banner of struggle against capital and is the strongest of the socialist states

We are strong, but we are threatening no one and have no intention of attacking anybody. But let the imperialists not threaten us. To the threats of the imperialists, we can reply with the words of Alexander Nevsky: whoever comes to us sword in hand shall perish by the sword.

The strength of the countries of the socialist camp is in the proletarian solidarity and friendship of the peoples of these countries. We and you, our Polish friends, well understand that it is necessary to strengthen friendship between our countries. The Soviet Union has always helped and continues to help the Polish People's Republic and we do not refuse to help you in the future. But on what conditions? On conditions of equality?

J. Cyrankiewicz: On principles of friendship.

Together with Comrade Cyrankiewicz, we have discussed the meaning of relations based on equality. The enemies of socialism, the enemies of friendship between socialist countries, frequently accuse us of pursuing a special motive while rendering aid. But we neither had nor have any motive other than that of strengthening friendship among countries of the socialist camp.

We advocate relations based on equality. More, in developing our cooperation with the socialist countries, we render them all-sided fraternal aid. If we were to adhere to the principles of equality as understood by the capitalists, then we would have to sell only what we can sell and buy only what we need. But in that case the more economically developed countries would be the winners and the less developed countries—the losers. We are guided by the interests of socialism and therefore cannot found our relations with countries friendly to us on such principles. For socialist countries that is not enough.

We must regard the relations between our countries as relations within a friendly family of nations which have gathered under the banner of socialism. Recently, we had

talks with the Albanians and rendered them aid to strengthen the socialist economy of Albania. Would such aid have been given if formally we would have been guided only by principles of equality? That is friendly mutual understanding and mutual aid. It is broader, deeper and fuller.

We advocate such relations with Poland as well, with all socialist countries. We do not want them to fall into enslaving dependence on the capitalist countries. We want them to build their lives in accordance with the vital interests of their peoples. In rendering such aid, the Soviet Union strives to promote the growth and strength of each socialist country so as still further to enhance the might of the socialist camp.

We render such aid without ulterior motives not only to socialist states but also to other, non-socialist countries who are carrying on a struggle for their freedom and national independence. Our people understand that we want to strengthen friendship with other countries in order to defend peace all over the world. We have no other purpose. We are prepared to be friends with all countries, including the United States of America.

In short, our most ardent desire is to make peace secure. We say that not because we are afraid of anybody's threats, but because we know what terrible misfortune war brings people. We believe that common sense will triumph. But if the imperialists unleash war, our hearts will not tremble and we are strong enough to crush our enemies.

The stronger the friendship and unity of the socialist countries, the more lasting and more secure will peace be throughout the world. This cause is served by the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Polish People's Republic, the twelfth anniversary of which we are marking. The Treaty between our countries fully meets with the interests of both the Soviet Union and the Polish People's Republic, and of the cause of consolidating world peace.

Allow me to propose a toast to the health of our friends—to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic Comrade Cyrankiewicz, to the First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party Comrade Gomułka, to the Chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic Comrade Zawadzki, to the successes of the Polish People's Republic, to the successes and prosperity of the Polish people.

(N. S. Khrushchov's speech was interrupted time and again by applause.)

**INTERVIEW GIVEN
TO TURNER CATLEDGE,
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
OF *THE NEW YORK TIMES***

May 10, 1957

After an exchange of greetings, **Catledge** said

I have spent a few pleasant days in your country, stayed in Moscow and seen the May Day parade, which impressed me very much. I have been to museums in Moscow as well as in Leningrad and Kiev. My tour of the U.S.S.R. is ending. Now I am going to Stockholm. After that I intend visiting a few other European countries and will probably be back home by July 1.

It is very kind of you to receive me. Thank you very much. And now allow me to ask you a few questions.

Khrushchov. If you please.

Catledge: The purpose of my visit is to find out your point of view on some problems and not to enter into polemics with you. Properly speaking, I head the information section of the newspaper *The New York Times*, the collection of facts, and have little to do with its political section. Therefore, I should like to clear up some questions in order to help our readers get a fuller idea about the views of the leaders of the Soviet Union and about your country.

Please understand me correctly if some of my questions will seem provocative to you. I am asking my questions not to cause you any unpleasantness, but to get an all-sided impression of the Soviet point of view.

The first question that I should like to put to you is: do you support the idea of convening in the near future a high-level conference of representatives of the Great Powers and what, in your opinion, are the problems that could be examined at such a conference?

Khrushchov. We have frequently stated in the past that a meeting of the leaders of the governments of the Great Powers would be useful. The Soviet Government continues to maintain that position. However, such a meeting would be useful only if the main problems for discussion are carefully prepared beforehand. Otherwise the meeting would not be as useful as it could be and would only be a disappointment for the participants in the conference and for the peoples they represent.

Now as to the problems that could be examined at such a conference. We believe that one of the main problems requiring discussion is the question of ending the tension in the relations between states and, primarily, between the Great Powers. Second, there is the question of European security. Europe is the chief area of international tension, where there is a knot, as it were, of the problems that create tension between states.

Settlement of the issue of European security should lead to the liquidation of military blocs and to the creation of a normal situation in Europe. Perhaps it would be expedient to set up some kind of special body where the participants in a European security system could exchange views to prevent tension in the relations between countries. If enough confidence was established, then in that case, perhaps, the need for a special body would fall away and problems could be examined in the United Nations.

If we are to speak of international tension more concretely, then the matter will evidently come down in the final analysis to the relations between two countries—between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Figuratively speaking, we may say that just as it is necessary to tear off the leaves of a head of cabbage one by one to

come to the heart, so in this case if we remove one by one all outstanding or disputed issues between countries we will in the end reach the heart, that is, the contradictions between our two countries, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. This is because the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. are the two most powerful nations industrially and from the military point of view, nations which possess atomic and hydrogen bombs as well as powerful conventional arms. They are engaged in the most active polemics in the international arena.

We believe that if the Soviet Union reaches agreement with the United States, it will not be difficult to come to an agreement with Britain, France and other powers. Of course, our agreement should not be to the detriment of Britain, Germany, France or any other power.

If we are to mention other members of NATO, it should be noted that Norway, for example, evidently is in that organization by mistake. Most Norwegians are thinking of how Norway could leave the North Atlantic bloc. The same applies to Denmark, which could do little even if she became angry with the Soviet Union. That also concerns the Netherlands. We regard Canada as another peace-loving power which found herself in NATO by mistake as a result of conditions that took shape in the recent past. In addition to the U.S.A., the only power that might threaten the Soviet Union is Luxemburg, N. S. Khrushchov said in jest.

Therefore, in the final analysis, tension comes down chiefly to the relations between two Great Powers—the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Consequently, the question is whether our relations will develop on a friendly basis or whether they will continue to be strained. The U.S.A. is a highly developed capitalist country. The Soviet Union is a highly developed socialist country. There will always be ideological differences between us. But that should not prevent us from living as good neighbours. We are indeed neighbours in the North, where Chukotka is contiguous to Alaska. Divergences in questions of ideology

should not prevent us from developing normal diplomatic, cultural, economic and other relations between our countries.

That is one course.

The other course is to continue stockpiling weapons. Here account should be taken of the fact that with atomic and hydrogen weapons, with rockets and intercontinental ballistic missiles there is always the chance that war can break out as a result of some fatal mistake or accident. That would be a great misfortune for our two countries and for the rest of the world.

That is why it would be wise for the leaders of the Great Powers to meet more frequently and settle various issues by exchanging views, by reaching agreement. That is why we in the Soviet Union desire talks with the U.S.A. But I want to say that if some leaders in the U.S.A. will confront us with preliminary conditions as, for example, Mr. Dulles, the U.S. Secretary of State, likes to do, we shall not accept them. Mr. Dulles quite frequently puts forward conditions such as the "liberation" of the East European countries from "slavery," the unconditional unification of Germany. If such conditions are advanced, it might take another 200 years before we come together again, for on these matters we are inflexible.

You like to call our socialist system a slave system. We, on the other hand, regard the capitalist system as a system of slavery for the working people, for the overwhelming majority of the people. Many years ago, Karl Marx convincingly showed that the capitalist system is a system under which the majority of the people are mercilessly oppressed. I think that at the moment we had better not argue this point.

As regards the German problem, it can and must be settled only by the German people themselves. The problem can be settled only when Adenauer meets Grotewohl, when the representatives of Berlin meet the representatives of

Bonn. Then the German problem can be settled successfully. It will be settled by the Germans themselves.

Between our countries there is no problem on which we cannot agree. Naturally a new meeting must be more fruitful than the meeting in Geneva, where in a number of cases the partners in the talks dragged out a Scottish reel. That is my point of view of another meeting of the Heads of Government of the Great Powers

I should like to add to what I have said that we are always prepared to exchange opinions with other states on questions such as disarmament, the banning of atomic and hydrogen bombs, the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and others. We are always prepared to hold talks on these problems and are ready to come to a reasonable agreement.

Catledge. I should like to clarify one point. When you spoke of the possibility of setting up a special body for exchanges of views, did you have in mind a body for exchanges of views only between the Soviet Union and the United States of America or between other powers as well, and did you have in mind the creation of a special body or talks between powers through ordinary diplomatic channels?

Khrushchov: We could, of course, exchange views through diplomatic channels as well but that would drag things out. Issues could be settled much more quickly at direct meetings. If, say, N. S. Khrushchov added in jest, our Minister Gromyko were to meet your Secretary of State Dulles they might not reach agreement even in a hundred years and perhaps only our grandchildren would see some results of their talks.

Catledge Do you have in mind one meeting or a series of meetings?

Khrushchov: I have no definite plan. If the first meeting provides a good basis there is no reason why such meetings should not continue. But the main thing is to set going the issue whose settlement is being awaited by the whole of mankind, the issue of peace or war.

I want to explain that when I spoke of setting up a special body for talks between powers I had in mind a body that could be organized in case agreement was reached on a system of European security, with the participation of the U.S.A. in this body

Catledge. Do you know of any plan by some power, whether the Soviet Union, the United States or a third power, of convening a high-level conference, or are you expecting someone to put forward such a plan?

Khrushchov. So far we have not exchanged views with anybody on this score. I only spoke of our point of view.

Catledge. I want to ask you a small question about a very big problem. You said that under certain conditions views could be exchanged in the United Nations. Do you regard the United Nations as an important international instrument for the settlement of international problems?

Khrushchov. The United Nations can, of course, be regarded as a useful instrument. But I would be going against my conscience if I called it an important instrument for the settlement of international problems today. So long as a situation exists in UNO where everything is bossed by the United States, where the United States commands countries receiving sops from it, that organization will in effect be not an international organization but a branch of the U.S.A.

Of course, even today it happens that UNO expresses the aspirations and desires of the peoples. But, regretfully, such cases are rare.

Catledge. You are probably well aware that the people of the United States do not want war much as the people of the Soviet Union. You probably know that throughout their history, the U.S.A. have never started an aggressive war. In the light of that do you really think that the United States of America and their allies are planning aggression against the Soviet Union?

Khrushchov. I consider that to be an indisputable fact! A country which does not want war would not stockpile

weapons but would seek agreement with the other side. There is no doubt that the American people do not want war, but the United States of America is a highly developed centralized capitalist state, the Government of which represents big banks and monopolies. Without asking the people, they constantly seek to increase their profits. Among American leaders there are irresponsible people who for the sake of egoistic aims pursue an adventurist policy which they call a policy of "balancing on the brink of war," a policy of strength.

It is one thing when a trained acrobat balances on a rope. If he makes a slip and falls, only one man perishes. When that happens we are very sorry. But if a political leader, pursuing a policy of "balancing on the brink of war," makes a slip, his slip might bring death to millions of people. That must not be forgotten. Neither must we forget that some U.S. statesmen themselves say that they are following a policy "from positions of strength" and pursuing it "on the brink of war." In short, in the United States of America the working people do not want war, they want peace and friendship among nations. But unfortunately they have practically no influence on the policies of the U.S.A. They are cleverly tricked during election campaigns and virtually do not even know for what they are voting.

The press, radio, television, meeting halls—all these material media are controlled by a handful of capitalists, of rich men who are able to do what they want, to direct policy in whatever direction they need. To this end all means are used, including trickery, bribes and so forth. Of course, if the working people of the U.S.A. were to be asked, most of them would say that they want peace and not war. Evidently the day will come when the people will have their say after all, because things cannot go on like this eternally.

You might say that all this is communist propaganda. But you know that I am a Communist, a representative of the working class. You came to talk with me and

I can say nothing else on the subject because I have no other views on these questions.

Catledge. As I understand it, the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government is, in particular, to encourage free mutual visits to the Soviet Union and other countries by students, engineers, scientists, technicians, journalists, cultural workers and so forth. Is that correct?

Khrushchov. Yes, quite correct. We want that.

Catledge. Now I should like to take on a different role, not the role of a propagandist of the capitalist system but the role of a propagandist of my profession. As a representative of a big American newspaper I stand for free exchange of information. In this connection I should like to ask you if you do not think that the censorship in the Soviet Union for foreign correspondents defeats its purpose and creates bigger problems than it settles. In the U.S.A. and other Western countries the reports of foreign correspondents are not censored.

Khrushchov. In the Soviet Union a check on the flow of news, or, as you put it, censorship, is applied only in the case of slanderous reports. Soviet people cannot be impartial to slanderers who distort reality in their reports, who write all sorts of fabrications.

We in the Soviet Union cannot remain impartial also to people who call for the disruption of the normal life of society or for murder. If the utterances of such people are restricted it does not mean that freedom of the press is curtailed. In cases where a correspondent wants to send abroad a report that distorts the real life of our country, our institutions take measures to prevent such distortions and slander from appearing. I think that is right.

I would not call this censorship but only a more rational use of the material means at the disposal of society in order not to waste money on telegraph communication, paper and so on. We want to use everything to benefit and not to harm society. Therefore, when an authorized person holds

up wrong, false reports, does not publish them, that benefits society. That is how we understand this question

Catledge: Would you like to visit the United States?

Khrushchov: Yes, I would like to visit the United States of America as I have heard a lot of interesting things about that country from my colleagues and from Soviet engineers, technicians and agronomists who have been there. But in my position I cannot go as a tourist, and besides Soviet tourists are not admitted into the U.S.A. at present, and I can hardly go there as a statesman right now as there is no reason for it. Therefore, I regret that I cannot visit the U.S.A.

Catledge: Do you think it would be useful if you, as the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, were to meet Dwight Eisenhower, as the leader of the Republican Party of the U.S.A.?

Khrushchov: Evidently, such a meeting would be useful and I would probably agree to it. I can say that I greatly admire President Eisenhower as I have told him personally and have said more than once to the former American ambassador in Moscow, Mr. Bohlen. I recall with pleasure the delightful meetings with President Eisenhower in Geneva.

Catledge: To make the purpose of my questions clearer, I must say that as one of the editors of *The New York Times* I have no direct relation with the editorial policy of that newspaper. In the last election campaign my newspaper supported President Eisenhower while personally I voted for Stevenson.

Khrushchov: Stevenson's utterances deserve attention. Of course, the election of a president is the internal affair of the Americans but in my view the policy of Stevenson without Dulles would possibly be more useful than the policy of Eisenhower with Dulles.

Catledge: Are there any theoretical or ideological objections to socialist countries, say Poland, receiving economic aid from capitalist countries, from the U.S.A. for example?

Khrushchov: No, there naturally have never been nor can

there be such theoretical objections. We ourselves would be prepared to receive from the U S A something that is necessary for our economy if it were economically beneficial to us.

But it must be borne in mind that the nature of capitalism is such that it cannot aid any country without pursuing its own selfish ends. Therefore, in receiving aid from capitalist states, a socialist or any other country must exercise caution so as not to lose its independence.

Have you ever watched a bee or a fly as it circles round honey and then alights on it? First its legs get caught, then its wings, and soon it is discovered that the bee or fly is stuck in the honey.

It is very dangerous for a socialist or any other country if it falls into capitalist honey and gets stuck in it. If use is made of such aid rashly it can lead to loss of independence. I see that you do not like my words very much, N. S. Khrushchov said, laughing.

Catledge: Now I should like to touch upon some problems bearing upon internal affairs. I have read quite a lot about your plans to reorganize the management of Soviet industry. I have also read your recent speech at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and, earlier, the theses of the report on your plan of reorganization or, as we call it, your plan of decentralization. In this connection, I should like to ask how long these plans were discussed in the Soviet Union?

Khrushchov: The theses on the problem of reorganizing the management of industry and construction were published in our press on March 30, 1957, and since then they have been widely discussed in the Soviet Union.

Catledge: Was the problem discussed before the theses were published?

Khrushchov: In the Party, the plan of reorganizing the management of industry was discussed at the February Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The February Plenary Meet-

ing of the C C found it necessary to publish the theses on the further organizational improvement of the management of industry and construction and since their publication they have been discussed virtually at every factory, at collective farms and institutions, in military units. The entire population of our country discussed these theses. I must say that this question stems from the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Cattledge: I am very much interested to know how decisions are adopted by leading bodies in the Soviet Union and what procedure is followed in adopting these decisions which become the expression of the views of the collective leadership in the Soviet Union. Does the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union meet regularly? How does it adopt decisions? Are minutes taken of the sittings of the Presidium? Do you have clashes of opinion at meetings of the Presidium?

Khrushchov: The Presidium of the C C, C P S U meets regularly at least once a week. The Council of Ministers also meets at least once weekly. Plenary Meetings of the C C, C P S U are convened at least twice a year.

More often than not, when questions are examined at meetings of the Presidium of the C C., different points of view are expressed, as the members of the Presidium strive to examine the problem under discussion as thoroughly as possible. During the discussions, the members of the Presidium usually arrive at a unanimous point of view. If on some question unanimity cannot be reached, the problem is decided by a simple majority vote.

Of course, very heated debates sometimes arise. But that is quite natural in a democratic discussion.

Cattledge: Perhaps you know that last year *The New York Times* published the text of your speech at the 20th Party Congress in which the excesses of the Stalin period were criticized. Were there any essential omissions or distortions in the text of your speech as published in the Western countries?

Khrushchov I do not know what text you are talking about. I heard that there was a text fabricated by the American intelligence service and published in the U.S.A. and that it was given out as the text of my report at the 20th Party Congress. But the publishing house of Allen Dulles has no great standing in the Soviet Union. I have not the least desire to read what Allen Dulles fabricates.

Catledge What do you think Stalin's position will be in the history of the Soviet Union?

Khrushchov Stalin will occupy a worthy place in the history of the Soviet Union. He had great shortcomings, but he was a devoted follower of Marx and Lenin, a devoted and staunch revolutionary. Stalin made many mistakes in the latter period of his activity, but he also made many great contributions to our country, to our Party and to the whole international working-class movement. Our Party and the Soviet people will always remember Stalin and pay tribute to him.

Catledge Could you specify some of the mistakes Stalin made?

Khrushchov This has already been done in our press. It was Lenin who spoke of Stalin's shortcomings in a document which is now known as *Lenin's Testament*. This document was published in the Soviet Union last year. Lenin very penetratingly noted Stalin's defects and warned the Party against them. At that stage Stalin drew the necessary conclusions from Lenin's warnings and kept within definite bounds. But evidently every man has weaknesses he cannot control. The negative features of Stalin's character, which Lenin had pointed out, developed as time went along and that harmed our cause, our Party. We, therefore, condemned these mistakes so that no one else would want to repeat them. These mistakes are contrary to the teaching of Marxism-Leninism.

Catledge Do you regard the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as the highest authority on the interpretation of Marxism-Leninism?

Khrushchov. You put the question in a way we Communists have never put it, as such a formulation is incorrect. No single person or party can assume the exclusive right of interpreting Marxist-Leninist theory. Marxism-Leninism is a science which is in the process of development, and every Communist Party can make its own contribution to its advance. Both the biggest country and the smallest country have equal conditions and equal opportunities. The question of interpreting Marxism-Leninism is a matter of quality and not of quantity.

However, since Marxism-Leninism is constantly gaining greater authority among the working people of all countries there have appeared pseudo-Communists, who are seeking to hang on to Marxism-Leninism. As time goes on and the socialist countries come to have greater influence among the working people of all countries there will probably be more and more of these pseudo-Communists as it will become fashionable to be an advocate of Marxist-Leninist theory. In view of that, our parties must treat pseudo-Communists strictly and expose them so as to prevent them from littering up Marxist-Leninist theory.

Some people say that anyone can call himself a Communist. But there exists a collective which holds to definite theoretical views, and it soon becomes evident which person only calls himself a Communist and is not one. Every Communist is tested on deeds, on facts.

I should say that on this point it would be quite in place to make a comparison with a company of soldiers on the march. If the whole company except one soldier is marching in step this soldier must drop out and keep somewhere in the tail until he learns to march. Such is the order in the Army. Such is our attitude to problems of Marxist-Leninist theory. We are very strict about observing the principles of Marxism-Leninism and tolerate no distortions whatever of Marxist-Leninist theory. We want Marxist-Leninist theory always to be pure.

Catledge: Would you name some pseudo-Communists?

Khrushchov: I had no intention of naming them now; when necessary we have named and shall name pseudo-Communists. I can only say that regretfully there are not a few pseudo-Communists.

Catledge. At present, are there greater chances for peace or for war?

I am asking that question because in the West there is the opinion that the Soviet Union would not have started to reorganize the management of its economy if it expected war soon.

Khrushchov: It is very difficult to say on which side the scales will tip—on the side of war or on the side of peace. The question of war and peace depends on many circumstances, it depends not only on the Soviet Union but also on other powers. I shall be more concrete—it depends most of all on the United States of America and on the Soviet Union. In the U.S.A. there are many generals who are making very silly statements about their being able to wipe the Soviet Union “from the face of the earth.” But these braggarts must remember that the other side, too, can hit back in the same way. On the whole, the tussle over this question is stupid. I repeat, it is difficult to say on which side the scales will tip.

As for the Soviet Union, it did and will continue to do all in its power not only to put off war but also not to have war at all. But, as I have already said, that depends not only on us but also on other powers and first and foremost on the United States of America.

To come back to the reorganization of the management of industry. That reorganization is by no means connected with military considerations. War has nothing to do with it. Perfection of the management of industry and construction pursues the aim of improving the management of our national economy. The measures we are taking will give us colossal opportunities to make better use of our resources, to run our national economy much more smoothly. The reorganization will not take much time: it will be completed

by July 1 or sooner. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that the reorganization chiefly affects the leadership and at present it is not planned to reorganize the work of separate enterprises. Improvement of the management of industry and construction is a rational economic undertaking that will give us a better opportunity of sooner catching up with the U.S.A. in terms of per capita supply. Therefore, the people making wild guesses are wrong when they affirm that the reorganization of the management of industry and construction in our country pursues a military purpose. Its aim is purely economic. We are doing all we can for peace, for the people, to prevent war.

Tell your people that we do not want war and are bending every effort to consolidate peace, which is in the interests of all nations, including the people of the United States of America.

Have you got any other questions?

Jorden: Among the ministries that are to remain after the reorganization of the management of industry and construction there is the Ministry of the Medium Machine-Building Industry. There is an assumption that this ministry is the equivalent of the Atomic Energy Commission in the United States. Could you say if that is true and would in that case M. G. Pervukhin hold the same post as Admiral Straus is holding in the U.S.A.?

Khrushchov: Possibly that is so, but to say the truth I do not know exactly what Admiral Straus' job is.

Catledge: Do you think the present situation in the Middle East might break out into a general war?

Khrushchov: It is very difficult to reply to this question because it is not Soviet troops that are in the Middle East but an American fleet commanded by quite a boastful admiral who makes pompous speeches. I can only say that the sending of the American Sixth Fleet to the Eastern Mediterranean was not a wise move. If that policy continues, anything might happen, but let that be deliberated first and foremost by the Americans themselves.

It is not wise to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

I can say that it is doubtful if the peoples of the Near and Middle East will voluntarily agree to put on themselves the yoke of American colonialism instead of British as the American yoke is no lighter than the British. The people will never reconcile themselves to colonial orders.

Catledge: Does this apply to Hungary as well?

Khrushchov The situation in Hungary is quite different, because Hungary is an independent state with its own independent government, which is pursuing its own independent policy. The colonial countries, on the other hand, are deprived of independence; with the help of a policy of the whip and cake they are forced to walk between shafts, but the peoples of the colonial countries will not cease their struggle against colonial orders and the new colonizers will be just as disappointed as the old ones.

T. Catledge gave his thanks for the interview and expressed the hope that he would meet N. S. Khrushchov when the latter visited the U.S.A.

Pravda, May 14, 1957

INTERVIEW GIVEN TO CBS CORRESPONDENTS

May 28, 1957

On May 28, N. S. Khrushchov granted an interview to Messrs. Schorr, Novins and Cutler of the American Columbia Broadcasting System.

The talk was tape-recorded and televised in the U.S.A. on June 2.

The transcript of the talk follows

Novins: Mr. Khrushchov, we are very grateful to you for allowing us to come here. We have many questions we'd like to put you through your interpreter and I'm sure you must have many answers that would be of tremendous interest to millions of Americans.

So, if you're ready, sir, let us begin. Mr. Schorr will ask the first question.

Schorr: Mr. Khrushchov, let me begin with a subject that I think is close to your heart—agriculture.

You said a short while ago that the Soviet Union hopes in the next few years to overtake the United States in the production of milk, butter and meat. American specialists say this is not a realistic target, particularly as regards livestock breeding. They mean the more than 3-fold increase in the cattle herd. How are you planning to reach this?

Khrushchov: Unfortunately, when the working class of Russia, led by its Party under Lenin, took power into its own hands and called on the toiling peasantry to support it

not only many Americans, but also many people in other countries, including people who style themselves scientists, refused to believe that Soviet power would last even a month. They thought it would crash soon. Only one of your countrymen, John Reed, the man who wrote *Ten Days That Shook the World*, had the perspicacity to see that a new era had arrived. I recall this to show you how the October Revolution was met in America and in the West.

When we began our five-year plans, practically no one in the West believed in our undertakings. They looked on us as dreamers.

But 40 years have passed and we have boosted our industrial output 30-fold. We have left Britain, France and Germany behind and are now second to the United States, the biggest capitalist country. And we are now about to tackle the basic task of overtaking the leading capitalist countries in production per head of population.

First of all we believe that the conditions are ripe for tackling the job of catching up with the United States in the production of meat and dairy products. As regards production of milk and butter per head of population we shall reach the United States level next year—1958. This year, apparently, we shall catch up with it in milk and butter output, i.e., produce as much as the United States. But since we have a bigger population, we shall need another year to equate per capita production. That is why I say 1958.

With regard to meat, the matter is more complicated, that is true. That is why we have fixed 1960-61 for meat. I can't be more precise at present, because this is a task for the whole of the country and the people to accomplish. The Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government have set the sights, but the country, that is, the collective farmers, the working men and women, the engineers, livestock and crop experts, will reach the targets, and we are sure this will be done roughly in 1960-61. Your experts who say this is unfeasible echo in a way some of our economists. They, too, told me the target could be achieved

only in 1975. We shall have a good laugh at both our prophets and yours. For the target will be reached.

Cutler: Mr. Khrushchov, I also have an interest in meat. And I've heard experts say that no country in the world has ever managed to step up meat production three and a half times in four years. Maybe you Communists have some way of making each cow bear twins?

Khrushchov: That is also possible. (*Animation, laughter.*) Cases are known of cows giving birth not only to twins but also to triplets. But, naturally, we are not banking on that. Our reckoning is this: pork will play the dominant part in our meat production. The pig, as you know, is a prolific animal. In this respect the possibilities for increasing meat output are limitless. Poultry, too, will play a very important part. Here we also have great possibilities. As regards beef, I think that in this five-year plan period we shall still have some shortcomings. That is why we are now planning to produce more pork, not as fat, but as bacon. The English like bacon and they consider that life is not bad when they have it. So, why shouldn't Russians, Ukrainians and the other Soviet peoples be able to digest bacon? I, too, think that it is excellent and tasty food.

If you are in any way acquainted with farming, you would bear in mind also the following consideration: so far with us slaughtering was at the expense mainly of yearlings, i.e., calves. We now intend to refrain somewhat from slaughtering calves and to kill two- and three-year-olds. In this case resources may double and treble, since they are greater according as a calf of one month, or one year, is slaughtered, or a two- or three-year-old. For us to catch up with the United States, we should step up production exactly 3.15 times. I think you, too, will have moved ahead a little by 1960, so we are planning a 3.5 increase. As I have said, if we do this not by 1960 but by 1961, we won't complain. Nor will our people complain about the Central Committee of their Communist Party and their Government.

The job is a stupendous one, but we'll do it. I rather like the idea that we are now in a position to compete with you, for the U.S.A., after all, is a very rich country. Neither should you be upset if we resolve this task in our favour. The United States leads the capitalist countries in output of products of all kinds. But now a new country, a socialist country, has appeared and it is anxious to overtake you. And, rest assured, we shall do so.

Schorr: Mr. Khrushchov, last year you had a good wheat crop. What is your estimate for this year's crop?

Khrushchov: That is a pithy question. Last year we had a good harvest, but I must say it was good only in Siberia and Kazakhstan. We did not have a good harvest in the Ukraine, the one-time granary of the Soviet Union, because most of the winter wheat perished there. The same thing happened in a number of the central regions. So that last year was not a particularly good one for us. So far, this year's prospects are better. Better in the sense that in the Ukraine the winter wheat outlook is very good. In the central regions—the chernozem belt—the prospects are also good. The same is true of Siberia and Kazakhstan. Things are not as good in the Volga basin, around Stalingrad and along the Caspian coast; but since these areas are not major grain suppliers, we are not unduly worried.

I must, however, make this reservation. I have some knowledge of farming and I know that the farmer is sure of his crop only when it is cut and stacked. And since in some areas they are only now sowing, or have just finished sowing, let us be cautious. But even if the crop does not reach last year's level, this will not deter us from going ahead with the job of boosting animal husbandry and solving the meat problem.

Novins: Mr. Khrushchov, you spoke of what you call healthy relations of competition between the peoples of our two countries. I would like to ask you, sir, in turning now to another field and in mentioning the international relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, especial-

ly in connection with the situation in Western Europe and in other parts of the world, what you consider are now the most burning questions that should be settled between the two countries?

Khrushchov: I believe the main thing is to normalize relations between countries and, above all, between the United States and the Soviet Union. I understand normalization as pulling down barriers in trade. We must begin by trading. You must pull down your "iron curtain" and, finally, not fear Soviet cooks when they go to America; they won't make a revolution there. We must have exchanges of cultural delegations, we need more in the way of contacts between our peoples, between businessmen. I believe this to be the main thing. So far you have been discriminating, you don't want to trade with us. Your politicians, upon whom this matter depends, believe that thereby they are harming communism. But you see this is doing us very little damage. On the contrary, this compels us to make things we could buy from you, and on which you could profit. Now we ourselves are making these things and are forging ahead. And that is how it will continue to be.

However, this attitude towards us charges the atmosphere, worsens relations and creates jitters in the world. It allows unbalanced people to speculate on war, to threaten war. This is very harmful. The peoples want tranquillity and peace, they want to live as human beings should live. We are striving to ensure these conditions and are doing all for our part to secure peaceful coexistence among countries with different economic systems, that is, between the capitalist countries and the socialist countries.

Novins: Mr. Khrushchov, can we conclude from what you have just said that you are prepared to permit Western diplomats greater freedom of movement in your country? Can we conclude that you will stop jamming "Voice of America" programmes? Can we conclude that you will take steps to initiate the contacts you are talking about?

Khrushchov: As regards restriction on the movement of Embassy personnel. If we reach mutual agreement, we would be prepared to improve matters and lift these restrictions. The restrictions are a sediment precipitated as the outcome of the poor relations between our two states.

Novins: Would you say they are part of your "iron curtain," Mr. Khrushchov?

Khrushchov: We answer your "iron curtain" and put up a bit of our own, one of plywood. (*Animation.*)

Now you have asked me about the "Voice of America." Our country is very musical. You know that very many fine singers have come from Russia. Even today we cut a good figure in this field. Therefore, if we hear a good voice, far from jamming it, we try to amplify it, so that it could be heard throughout the length and breadth of the country. But should a strange voice jar the ear, anybody will switch off the radio if he can, and if he can't he jams it, because this voice acts badly on his hearing. Therefore we shall not jam the "Voice of America" if it is really the voice of America—we respect the American people. But when it is not the voice of America, but some sort of malicious howling which is called the "Voice of America," we do not want the Soviet people to have a wrong picture of the American people and their voice.

Novins: Isn't there a contradiction here, Mr. Khrushchov, when you speak of economic competition, but at the same time, apparently, prevent competition of ideas? You take decisions instead of allowing people to decide themselves what they want to hear.

Khrushchov: Well, you see, attempts to separate us from the people are an old tune played on a well-worn gramophone record, a tune no one wants to listen to. We maintain that there is not, that there never was and that there will never be any other government apart from the Soviet Government, or any other policy apart from the policy of the Communist Party that would accord so with the interests of the people of the Soviet Union and the toiling folk in all countries, because we are not pursuing any bad aims

with respect to any other countries either. That is why the policy we are pursuing is the policy not only of the Communist Party. The Communist Party is the vanguard of its people, consequently this is the policy of the people, the policy of the Soviet peoples, and we are conducting it.

Now about contradictions. Are there any contradictions in our statements when we say we want peaceful competition? We want competition and in this competition we want to reveal the healthiest forces. The healthy force we call our system, the socialist system, because it is the most progressive, the youngest.

If you have some knowledge of how social systems change—and you probably do from history—you know that we were the heirs of a moribund capitalist system which the socialist system, the most progressive system, came to replace. And your grandchildren will live under socialism in America too. I predict this for you. Don't be frightened for your grandchildren. They will be amazed at their grandfathers who could not understand such a progressive teaching as that of scientific socialism.

And talking of the ideologies of the capitalist and socialist countries, we never attempted to hide that here there will be struggle, an ideological struggle. But we have never identified ideological struggle with war. This is a clash of ideas. The stronger idea, the more viable idea, that the people will back, will win. And if your American people—and at the moment they do not back the teaching of Marxism-Leninism—follow bourgeois politicians, is that a reason why we should start a war? Should we be enemies with America or other countries because of that? No! Let us live in peace, let us develop our economies, let us compete, let us trade, exchange experience on industrial development, agriculture and cultural achievements, while, as for the system to win, let history, our peoples, make the choice. I think this a good condition. When we say our system will win out, meaning that socialism will triumph, we do not mean we shall try to impose our system on anyone by war.

God save us from that! We believe it will win and will capture the minds of the people. But the system of each country should be established according to the wishes of its people. We do not see any other way and do not impose our own ideas.

That is what I can say in reply to your question

Schorr: Mr. Khrushchov, allow me to revert to your remark that the government and the people are indivisible. This reminds me of a recent statement from Peking which I think was also printed in *Pravda*, saying that in a socialist state there can be contradictions between the masses and the leaders. And in reproducing this in *Pravda*, do the Soviet Communists accept this idea and what is its importance for the Soviet Union?

Khrushchov: Each country, be it socialist or capitalist, has its development and its stages of development. We have been living for 40 years now, while the People's Republic of China is only 8 years old. So that what was necessary for us in our time need not necessarily be repeated by other socialist countries.

Every nation has its own history, its own customs, and the Communist parties and governments are obliged to heed this and take it into account. Our friends, the Chinese, are embodying in life many original ideas in the process of socialist construction. Some of these ideas are novel, taking into consideration China's specific features. We consider this quite normal and in no way contrary to Marxism-Leninism. Therefore we print much of this and, in substance, support it. I repeat, each country acts in accordance with its specific conditions, it does the things it finds suitable. This does not offend anyone and does not clash with our Marxist-Leninist views.

Cutler: Mr. Khrushchov, you said a short while ago that the United States was undoubtedly preparing war against the Soviet Union. Is this conviction really at the root of the Soviet Union's policy?

Khrushchov: That is not my opinion. I only spoke of what your politicians, your generals, your commanders and admirals say. They make so many speeches in your country, arguing that the U.S.A. can destroy the Soviet Union in a few hours. We, on the contrary, do not occupy ourselves with this. Our political leaders do not boast about how we could destroy the United States. This is silly and with us it is even forbidden by law.

Schorr: I seem to remember Marshal Zhukov saying something of the sort.

Khrushchov: Think better about what Marshal Zhukov said! I think Zhukov did not say that. Tell me when and where he said anything of the sort, that we would destroy America? We have said the following, this I do not deny. If military leaders and some politicians of the U.S.A. say they can destroy the Soviet Union, if today there are weapons that allow of destroying some country or other, then the country which one wants to destroy is evidently likewise capable of destroying some country. In this respect we have no doubts about our strength. But I would call anyone who wanted to destroy another country a madman—to do so would be a disaster, a great calamity for mankind.

Some people reproach me for allegedly changing my point of view, since I had previously said that in the event of a nuclear war capitalism would be destroyed. I repeat this now. But, as we see it, capitalism should be abolished not by war and armed conflicts, but through struggle on the ideological front, on the economic front. It is our belief that capitalism will be vanquished not only by the forces of the Soviet Union. Capitalism in America will be fought by the working class of that country.

Cutler: Mr. Khrushchov, you have just said a future war would destroy capitalism. Don't you think that a future war would destroy communism too?

Khrushchov: No, it wouldn't. War would be a calamity for mankind, would take a heavy toll of human life and

values. But man, nevertheless, would not perish. And since man will survive, the ideas with which he lives will likewise endure, and the ideas of Marxism-Leninism are immortal. Humanity would rid itself of capitalism. But the price would be such that there should be no resort to war. Both the socialist and capitalist countries would suffer. So we shall just have to live side by side on one planet.

You like capitalism. We like socialism. Let us engage in an ideological struggle, let us have differences, let us compete economically. But we shall have to live together. We want to live without war, in peace. We believe that we could have friendly relations, that we could be friends as far as ideological differences allow. That is perfectly feasible. There are many things that unite us, and we would willingly cooperate with the peoples of the United States.

Schorr: There is one thing, Mr. Khrushchov, that I can't understand anyhow: how can you speak of coexistence with a country if you really believe this country is planning war against the Soviet Union?

Khrushchov: But what are we to do? We would like you not to plan war, but you are planning it. We are forced to reckon with this. But don't forget that the war would be a costly affair, besides, the military designs of the American generals cannot be carried out.

And so we must coexist. If you were to manifest the same desire to live in peace as we do, we would free our people from taxes, from the extra expenditure on armaments, would not waste manpower in making things not needed for life. And the peoples of America, the Soviet Union and all the other countries of the world would but gain by this.

We are most anxious to have peace and friendship with the American people. We want friendship not for our two strong Powers to join forces against the weaker. We want it because if we have good friendly relations with the United States all the other countries will be the gainers.

I hardly think that Luxemburg will threaten us. Friendship between our two states would benefit all nations.

This is something I very much wanted to tell you so that you, on your part, could transmit to your people, through your information and technical channels, our cherished dream of living in friendship with the United States.

Schorr: May I cut this down to a concrete issue—to disarmament. The United States has returned to the resumed disarmament talks in London with the proposal for a so-called small limited step toward disarmament. We know the Soviet Union has striven more for complete and immediate prohibition of both atomic and hydrogen bomb tests and nuclear weapons, but the question of control made this quite difficult. Do you see any hope of agreement on the basis of the present American approach—an initial small step?

Khrushchov: So far I am not aware what steps the United States intends to take, since Mr. Stassen has not yet stated his terms. We are, however, ready to agree to less than an immediate and all-embracing disarmament settlement. We could begin with something small, so as to arrive at something bigger. In pursuit of this aim, we, unilaterally, cut our armed forces, reducing them by 1,800,000 men; we have reduced our armed forces in East Germany by more than 30,000 men. We have relinquished the fortress we held by treaty in Finland. We have done much for mutual understanding and agreement on disarmament with other countries. But so far neither the United States, Britain, nor France has responded, a fact we deeply regret.

Cutler: After cutting your armed forces by 1,800,000 men, how many men are left?

Khrushchov: I had no idea you would ask this question. It was not on the list submitted to me. I have not consulted our Defence Minister as to how many troops he has and find it difficult to give the exact figure. I would not like to give a wrong figure to distinguished representatives of a

Great Power. We are, however, always prepared to answer this question.

Schorr: May I ask you something about disarmament, something that has perplexed me a long time?

In the discussion of atomic bomb tests the Soviet Union maintains that all atomic and hydrogen explosions can be detected. If this is so, why did the Soviet Government not give a pre-warning or subsequently even report the last five tests in your country?

Khrushchov: What would that give mankind? Nothing. Of what importance is it? Once an explosion takes place the air is contaminated. A man will not be the better if I tell him beforehand that I am about to explode a bomb and contaminate the air, and that his health will, therefore, suffer. In my view the question of registering explosions is sheer speculation.

We raise a fundamental issue—stop the explosions. But those who advocate registering explosions do so not because they kindly give pre-warning, but because they cannot afford to have explosions on their own territories and they are obliged to explode their bombs over small islands, located in international latitudes. They cannot do this without warning, since neutral ships or aircraft may be in the vicinity. There would be an uproar if they failed to do so. If the United States could explode bombs without warning it would do so. There are, however, those who would like to evade a direct answer to the question of banning hydrogen and atomic weapons and stopping the explosions. They would like to hold forth on advance notice being given by any country preparing to explode a bomb. This is beating about the bush, an attempt to mislead the public. We say: Let us stop the explosions, let us stop the tests, let us ban atomic and hydrogen weapons and cut the armed forces. Then we can get around to full disarmament. That is our programme. Let us begin at least with a little, but let us begin. So far, we've had nothing but talk, exercises in semantics.

Schorr: Although we haven't got the time now to go into the long discussion I would like on this question, allow me, however, to remind you of one small fact. Nuclear weapon tests on the American continent, in the United States, were announced, including those to come in Nevada.

Novins: Mr Khrushchov, let me turn to an associated talking point, the question of Western Europe. As you know, sir, there have been various proposals for definite conditions under which troops would be withdrawn, and these questions also bear on Germany's reunification.

I would like to ask you what, in the opinion of the Soviet Government, are the conditions under which the Soviet Union would feel adequately secure in order to withdraw its troops from countries where they are now stationed?

Khrushchov: I would like to answer Mr Schorr who asked about registration. I have already made it clear that you are forced to register because your territory is not so large as to detonate bombs without warning. You do this because of your geographical situation which does not allow you to set off explosions without a warning, and you are, moreover, putting a good face on things. That is wrong. You are misleading both your people and other nations. Come, let us have an honest discussion and policy on this question: that would be better.

Now about our security. To say we are afraid of something does not fit us. We are not afraid of anything. We do not want war, but, as they say, the matter does not depend on us alone. Should a war be thrust upon us, our people will fight with the utmost ardour and loyalty; they will staunchly defend their country.

What steps should be taken to prevent war? Why does not the United States, and the others, withdraw their troops from West Germany, from the Western countries—France, Italy, Turkey, Greece and I don't know where else. We could then move our troops out of East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Rumania. We have no troops anywhere else. This, besides being very useful, would be the

first step in testing good relations and in establishing a good atmosphere that would not reek of war. It would facilitate good peaceful relations which could develop between our countries. We have said this before, we repeat it now, and we are prepared to do everything necessary.

Schorr: Would that be included in a system of aerial inspection for supervising such an agreement?

Khrushchov: That is another matter. We shall withdraw our troops from foreign countries. But as for inspection... How can we inspect foreign countries? You have a hankering to peep into a neighbour's bedroom when he has drawn the curtains. We look on that as being indecent. But if you are intent on doing so, let's come to terms. We agree, but on definite mutual conditions. Comrade Zorin has stated these terms in London. The United States has promised an answer. We are waiting for it. Whether we shall be able to accept it or not, it is now hard to say.

Novins: Mr Khrushchov, when you talk of withdrawing American troops from Western Europe you mean removing them to more than 3,000 miles away. But in talking of a withdrawal of Russian troops from East Germany, it would mean removing them to a distance that could be covered in two hours.

As a realist, don't you think some assurances would be needed to ensure mutual confidence? What is Russia prepared to do?

Khrushchov: You are not altogether right in your arithmetic in reckoning the distances of withdrawal. You withdraw a shorter distance than we do. Britain, for instance, is just across the Channel, and the United States on the other side of the ocean. I find it hard to say how long it takes to get by sea from the United States to Germany or France, but you can figure out how long it would take our troops to travel by rail, for example, from Irkutsk or Vladivostok. We have farther to go than you.

Besides, in talking about disarmament let us trust each other and not look on one another as a pair of robbers. Let

us approach the matter with the yardstick of the honest man; we shall pledge our word and make it possible to supervise our pledge. Let us establish posts at certain points to forestall any surprise attack from either side. The terms which we offer are adequate to ensure control and preclude a sudden attack by one country on another.

Cutler: Mr. Khrushchov, aren't you afraid that if you withdraw your troops from some of the states of Eastern Europe, not all of them will remain communist?

Khrushchov: That is a fable which you, evidently, take for reality. According to you the communist system in one or another country can be bolstered up by our armed forces. I wouldn't fight for such a communist system. A communist system must rest on the will of the people. If the people don't want it, let them establish the system of their choice. So you see, we shall be bold enough to withdraw our troops from all the countries where they are stationed—from Poland, Hungary and Rumania; we shall be bold enough to withdraw them from East Germany. And I am sure that the peoples of these countries will defend their system still better.

Schorr: Mr. Khrushchov, are you sure that in each country now having a communist regime, it rests on the will of the people?

Khrushchov: Absolutely. How could it be otherwise? See what methods Chiang Kai-shek is using to keep the Chinese people in check in Taiwan. The Americans squandered 6,000 million dollars on him to keep him on the mainland. And what was the result? All the arms he got from the Americans found their way to the China of Mao Tse-tung. Who did that? The people did it, because the Chiang Kai-shek regime was alien to the wishes of the Chinese people and it went down.

Recall the regime in tsarist Russia? Revolutionaries were executed. But what happened? The people arose and established their own system. After the October Revolution we were attacked by most countries. You Americans also

fought against us. Didn't you? And the British and the French! My goodness, who didn't fight us! But how did the business end? The people threw out all the invaders and made the Soviet system strong. This means our system chimes with the vital interests of the people, and the working people fight for it.

The Germans, you will remember, got to the Volga in 1942, they imagined that the people would revolt and help them carry out their plans for conquest. But what happened? They were vanquished, Hitler is in his grave, while the Soviet Union is prospering, developing its socialist economy, confidently advancing towards communism. You see that in the matter of meat, milk and butter we are already overtaking you, and in industry we shall certainly catch up and forge ahead, and build communist society in our country.

Schorr: Mr. Khrushchov, we are not here to argue with you, but to learn your view. But since you've raised the matter of American unpleasantries in Formosa and since we are speaking frankly, I would like to ask you, how long, in your opinion, would the Kadar regime hold out in Hungary without Soviet troops and tanks?

Khrushchov: Let us put it to the test. Withdraw your troops from Germany and France and we'll withdraw ours from Germany, Poland and Hungary. You will see that the Kadar regime, the regime of the Hungarian people, mind you, will flourish and prosper for all time. Where the working class has won power it will not yield it to the exploiters, it will consolidate it and develop its economy and culture. That is what the Kadar rule is. It is not the personal rule of Kadar. Kadar is the servant of the Hungarian people; this is the cause of the people of Hungary, of its working class.

Novins: Mr. Khrushchov, since we haven't much time left I would like to take a bit of it to ask you this: What big step, do you think, the Russians, the Russian Soviet Government, that is, are prepared to take now to ease the tension

we have talked about, and to achieve better understanding among the countries of the world?

Khrushchov: I think we are continually searching for and making these steps. But if only one side takes them and the other doesn't, then we shall get nowhere, because the matter of easing world tension doesn't depend only on the one side. We are waiting for America, for Britain, and France to take steps. We shall not lag or be out of step.

Here are our most radical proposals: we have submitted our disarmament plans; we suggest lifting trade restrictions right away; let the United States remove its "iron curtain" and agree to a broad interchange of delegations on various matters and professions. What else? I find it hard to suggest any more at the moment. That'll be enough for a beginning. If America were to follow suit we would make great progress.

Novins: May I ask one more question, sir? Would you say that post-war history since the end of the war warrants the assumption that in some cases the Soviet Union was wrong or blundered in international relations, thus bringing about some cockpits of tension?

Khrushchov: I do not know what mistakes you have in mind. Possibly there were mistakes on both sides. But if we approach the controversies sensibly it may be that we could avoid complications.

In my view the tension that flared up was, apparently, caused by the desire of the capitalist world to probe us. When your politicians say that they will be prepared to talk business with us when the "enslaved," people are "liberated," they have in mind the socialist countries of Europe. But, gentlemen, if that is how you understand slavery I would like to tell you that we, too, have our notion of it. We regard the capitalist system as being one of slavery. We regard the people under capitalism as living in capitalist bondage. If we see this as the source of tension, we shall hardly obtain any worthwhile results.

Novins: Mr Khrushchov, I'm sure we all agree that such an argument would yield little at this talk. We are, however, extremely grateful to you for taking part in the "Face the Nation" programme

Khrushchov: On my part, I would like to thank you for the opportunity of meeting you, listening to your questions and answering them. I repeat, my one desire is that our people should have good relations with your country, with your people.

Please convey greetings and my best wishes to your people.

Pravda, June 4, 1957

**SPEECH
AT A SOVIET-FINNISH
FRIENDSHIP MEETING
IN HELSINKI**

June 8, 1957

Mr. President U. K. Kekkonen,
Mr. Speaker of Diet K. A. Fagerholm,
Mr. Prime Minister V. J. Sukselainen,
Gentlemen,

Dear friends and comrades,

We are glad to be present at your large meeting of members of the Finland-Soviet Union Society. We thank the leaders of the society and all our friends present here for the hospitality and cordial welcome accorded us.

Allow me to extend to you, our friends, and through you to the people of Finland, friendly, cordial greetings from the Soviet people and to wish the diligent Finnish people every success and prosperity. (*Applause.*)

The Soviet people are well aware of the great and fruitful work of your society, aided by the state authorities of your country, in furthering friendship between our peoples. The place and the role of your society in Soviet-Finnish relations were very well described by the outstanding leader of your country, the late President Paasikivi. He said. "*We need the Finland-Soviet Union Society for all times. This is not just something transient, it is a matter of the main line of our country's foreign policy.*"

It is good to know that your society is one of the biggest public organizations in the country, comprising workers

and statesmen, peasants and cultural workers, businessmen and intellectuals. This testifies to the profound confidence enjoyed by your society among the broad strata of the people.

You and we are neighbours. And when neighbours live in peace and friendship things are better, more satisfactory. Do not we see this in the good-neighbour relations between Finland and the Soviet Union which during the post-war years have become better and stronger.

Although our social systems are different this does not hinder our countries and peoples from living in peace with one another, from trading actively and to mutual advantage, from exchanging experience and achievements in the economic, scientific, cultural and athletic spheres.

The experience of our relations shows that difference in social systems does not prevent us from being friendly and cooperative, without interfering in one another's domestic affairs.

As we see it, Finnish-Soviet friendship extends beyond the framework of relations between our countries and acquires an international significance, since it proves conclusively that good and friendly relations can be established between countries with different social systems.

"Export of communism," still held up as a bogey to frighten people in some countries, is the invention of those who fear peace and friendship among the nations. If there is any export really threatening the world today, it is, for example, the export of atomic weapons, the establishment of military bases on foreign soil. But the Soviet Union does not engage in this. It is not building military bases on foreign soil. It has, moreover, dismantled its military base on Finnish territory at Porkkala Udd. We recommend others to do likewise, for there would then be more confidence in the world and the peoples would be relieved of the oppressive burden of armaments and the fear of war.

In relations between states, what is important is not merely expressions of sentiments, but, chiefly, deeds.

Friendship grows and takes root when broad business contacts are widely developed, when political, economic and cultural relations are strengthened, when trade and reciprocal exchange of the products of labour are expanded. This is the essential link which cements friendship between the peoples of the world.

The principles of equality between our countries manifest themselves in the political as well as the economic sphere. It is a fact that trade between the U S S R. and Finland is based on the firm principle of cognizance of the interests of both parties. You and we have the most favourable objective conditions for a further expansion of trade.

Our long-term trade agreements ensure stability of economic ties. Each party knows in advance what it can get and what it, in turn, must produce and deliver. The transport conditions of our countries are exceedingly favourable. It can be said that geography itself aids us. We are only a stone's throw apart by sea, and not so very far by rail. The gauge is the same.

Shipbuilding, engineering and a number of other branches are well developed in Finland, not to speak of the wood-working and pulp industries. The Soviet Union has placed, and will continue to place, orders with Finnish industry.

Your business people tell us that Soviet orders for ships have paved the way for Finnish shipbuilders to other countries as well. We are not so immodest as to claim the credit for all this. A much bigger part, the decisive part, has been played by the technological level and talent of the Finnish specialists and shipbuilding workers.

To them we extend our sincere greetings, wish them success, and would ask them, nevertheless, not to forget us. We need your ships and machinery. And we think that you, too, would like your country to have not only more Soviet automobiles but to see Finnish plants use more of our up-to-date lathes and other machinery. Trade is a two-

way business. And we want it to develop more widely for the good of both countries.

A real friend never wants those with whom he is friendly to be unfriendly to his neighbours. We are very glad that you have good relations with Sweden, Norway and Denmark, and that they are steadily becoming better. You are trading extensively with Britain. You want to improve your peaceful relations with other countries. That is good.

We have always welcomed, and will continue to welcome, everything that benefits you, that strengthens your country, improves the life of the Finnish people and reinforces peaceful relations between our countries.

We ourselves are striving for better relations with all countries. But we have never sought, and never will seek, to improve our friendship with some countries by way of deterioration of friendship with others. We know very well what real friendship means and will always treasure it.

Esteemed friends!

The relations between the Soviet Union and Finland are clear to all. They rest on the solid basis of our joint Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid. This cannot but be a source of joy to our friends and to all who are interested in peace in Northern Europe.

The policy of your state—the policy of neutrality and independence, the policy of peace—extends a favourable influence on the situation in the northern part of Europe. We are confident that in the future, too, your government and all the Finnish people will cooperate successfully for lasting peace in Northern Europe, for making the Baltic a zone of eternal peace. This is a great and noble mission.

Let us not conceal the fact that there are still forces who look with dislike on the growing good-neighbour relations between the U.S.S.R. and Finland. In their endeavours to spoil our friendship they are guided not by good intentions with regard to Finland, but by altogether different motives—they would like us to quarrel with each other.

But a quarrel would not bring good to either of us. So those who are acting against friendship between our countries are our common ill-wishers.

That this is really the case can be seen from the experience of the past. Recall the last war. In 1944, when Finland took the course of peace with the Soviet Union, reactionary circles called for continuing the war to the last, no matter what the cost. They argued that peace with the U.S.S.R. would bring disaster to Finland, that the sole chance of salvation lay in preserving the alliance with Hitler Germany.

There were those who advised waging war together with Germany until the Soviet Union clashed with the Anglo-Saxons.

I think that there is no need now to waste words refuting the ill-starred politicians who impelled Finland towards the catastrophe which soon befell Hitler Germany. It is now clear to all that the withdrawal from the war and the reconciliation with the Soviet Union not only saved Finland from that dismal prospect, not only did not bring upon her the horrors with which the enemies of peace had intimidated the Finnish people, but, on the contrary, for more than 12 years now have assured Finland peace, tranquillity and economic progress.

The facts have shown that the enemies of reconciliation with the U.S.S.R., who spread monstrous fabrications about the Soviet Union to the effect that it would deprive Finland of its independence, intimidated the people of Finland in vain with fairy-tales that tens of thousands of Finns would be sent to Siberia, that Russian troops would occupy Finland and remain there. How ridiculous these assertions sound now. But those who spread them, unfortunately, are still about, and they are concocting others. One should be on guard against these slanderers and provocateurs who want to divert their country on to the road of international complications and imperil the peaceful labour of Finland's citizens.

For many years now Finland has enjoyed the blessings of peace. Her people enjoy the great advantage of not knowing the immeasurably inflated expenditure on armaments borne by the other Western states.

The realistic peace policy of the Finnish Republic chimes with the interests of peace and friendship between all nations. We are against tension in any part of the world, we want all countries, big and small, to live without fear for the morrow. It is our desire that peace shall prevail throughout Northern Europe, that our land and sea frontiers be frontiers of friendship with our neighbours.

We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that some countries which in substance are your neighbours and ours are being involved in the preparations for a new war through the various aggressive pacts and alliances, thereby imperilling their future. We are doing all in our power to convince these countries of the advisability of not proceeding further on this dangerous road.

Our leader and teacher Lenin was a true friend of the Finnish people. After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the 40th anniversary of which will be celebrated by progressive mankind this year, Lenin signed the decree granting Finland independence. This laid the firm foundation for the further strengthening of friendship between the peoples of Finland and the Soviet Union (*Prolonged applause.*)

True, forces subsequently appeared which did much to violate friendly relations between our countries.

The experience of the recent past shows that every infringement of good-neighbour relations between the Soviet Union and Finland simply played into the hands of the aggressive elements of the imperialist powers who think least of all of the national interests of Finland

Here I would like to remind you of the wise words of one of the greatest public figures of Finland, Snelman, who way back in 1863 said that "only in full friendship with

Russia can our people live and pave the way to independence." (*Stormy applause.*)

Dear friends, we rejoice particularly at the fact—and I would add that it is a specific feature of the Finnish state—that this meeting is attended by the President of the Republic, the Speaker of Diet, the Premier and Ministers. This shows that the work of your society is correctly understood by your Government.

We are delighted that the good tradition established by President Paasikivi—and he was aware of the significance of your society—is being carried on by President Kekkonen. We are glad of this. (*Stormy, prolonged applause*)

Dear friends, the Finland- Soviet Union Society has played and continues to play a big part in removing the mistrust that our common enemies tried to instil in the Finnish people during the past three decades. That is now a thing of the past. We are confident that the people of Finland, who are well aware of the importance of our mutual friendship, will never let anyone spoil the good-neighbour, friendly relations between Finland and the Soviet Union. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We believe that they, like the Soviet people, are true champions of peace and friendship between our countries. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Once again, dear friends, I wish you the best of success in your noble endeavour! (*Prolonged applause.*)

May the good friendship between the Soviet Union and Finland flourish and become stronger and stronger! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live world-wide peace! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

**STATEMENT
AT A PRESS CONFERENCE
IN HELSINKI**

June 13, 1957

During our stay in Finland newspapermen have submitted a number of questions to us concerning the international situation, including the disarmament problem. We deem it necessary to answer these questions, all the more so since many of them are a source of worry to all nations.

We have been asked how we assess the prospects for the disarmament talks and what significance we attach to establishing the necessary confidence between the Big Powers in the matter of reducing armaments and prohibiting atomic and hydrogen weapons

A disarmament settlement is possible only if there is confidence in the relations between the states. This goes above all for the Big Powers possessing the strongest armed forces and nuclear weapons.

How, indeed, can the disarmament problem be solved if one country looks on another as a robber who, in its opinion, is ready to hurl his military might against it. If we approach the matter soberly, we will have to admit that with such an attitude of the Great Powers to one another it will be impossible to halt the arms drive and, especially, eliminate the danger of atomic war.

It is said that control could be helpful in this matter because it, presumably, would remove all the difficulties. We have repeatedly expressed our views on the question of

control, and our stand is generally known. It should be recognized, however, so as not to mislead ourselves or others, that control cannot solve the question because, firstly, it cannot prevent preparation of aggression by one or another state bent on delivering a blow to another nation. It has long been generally accepted that control cannot discover concealed stocks of atomic or hydrogen weapons, or their clandestine production. Secondly, to be frank, we must recognize that even the most zealous advocates of control actually make no secret of the fact that it is one thing to laud it and quite another to admit foreign controllers to the plants and factories of one's own country, to its airfields and arsenals.

The fate of President Eisenhower's "open skies" proposal is interesting in this context. Notwithstanding all our respect for President Eisenhower, we have declared from the outset that "open skies" cannot yield anything positive, that they can only add to the suspicion of one power in relation to another. The United States is becoming increasingly aware of this, as can be seen from the fact that when new proposals concerning the zone of aerial inspection in Europe and also in the area of the Soviet Far East-Alaska-Western America were advanced, it turned out that they were not to the liking of the Americans. They are now saying that aerial photography should take in the Arctic icefields, which is utterly comic, to say the least.

What does this show? It shows that if we do not intend to engage in phrase-mongering and drawing out the disarmament talks, which have continued for approximately twelve years now, we should agree that talk about control as a preliminary to disarmament is actually nothing but camouflage screening plans to continue the arms drive.

To return to the question of confidence. Confidence between states is indispensable because without it we shall not solve the disarmament problem. The conditions exist for confidence, but they should be properly utilized. Everyone knows that an atomic war would be a dreadful calamity

for mankind. Hence the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and all other states—big and small—should agree, if they do not wish to take the dangerous road of adventurism, that coexistence, peaceful coexistence of states irrespective of their social systems, is the only way out of this predicament. This means that we should reach agreement on the urgent problems of safeguarding peace, consign the cold war policy for ever to the archives together, preferably, with its most zealous initiators.

Given the present state of confidence between the nations, do you think it possible, we are asked, to settle some disarmament problems immediately?

Yes, there are such problems. One is to discontinue atomic and hydrogen weapon tests. It is common knowledge that many countries are insisting on a settlement of this question. The reason for their insistence is also known. All the objective possibilities exist for reaching agreement on this question right now and for ending the tests. We regret that the United States and Britain are opposed to discontinuing nuclear weapon tests. If the establishment of control posts on the territory of the U.S.S.R., in the United States, Britain, and perhaps in certain other areas could help to reach agreement on this score, we would cooperate willingly.

We are convinced that those who object to discontinuing atomic and hydrogen bomb tests are pursuing a short-sighted policy, harmful to all countries and not least to the Western powers.

* * *

The correspondents then asked supplementary questions.

The correspondent of the Danish newspaper *Information* asked: Have the visitors seen anything in Finland which, in their opinion, would be useful in solving practical problems in the Soviet Union and if so would they cite corresponding examples?

Khrushchov: Every country has something of interest. And here in Finland we have seen many interesting things. For example, excellent building work: splendid products of the wood-working industry, fine finish of houses and hotels. There is something to learn from. I think that we will learn something from our Finnish friends and they, I hope, will help us in this matter.

We could also cite other interesting examples.

But if we were to speak about everything we could learn from much time would be required, which would drag out our press conference.

Question: When, in your opinion, would it be expedient to call a conference of the Heads of Government of the four Great Powers?

Khrushchov: From our standpoint it could be called any time. If you ask our side, we are ready to meet at any time and at any place. But it would be necessary to know whether the other side is ready for a meeting and not only for a meeting but also for a settlement of outstanding issues so as to ease the international tension and establish durable peaceful relations between the countries, ensure peaceful coexistence. But at the moment, in my opinion, the conditions for organizing a meeting have not yet matured on the other side.

Schorr, correspondent of the Columbia Broadcasting System, asked: What other countries would you like to visit in forthcoming months, would you like to visit the United States?

Khrushchov. Our plans provide for visiting a number of countries this year and, most likely, we will be able to do so. What countries? This will be announced in due time in the press and even over the radio. (*Laughter.*)

Now about visiting the United States of America. I have said many times that the United States is a very interesting country and we are greatly interested in it. It is the biggest, most powerful, and strongest capitalist country. And good relations on a world scale depend in large measure on nor-

mal relations between our countries. Hence, we are most anxious to establish good contacts with the United States of America.

As for our visit to the United States, how is that to be understood? If the idea is a trip such as tourists make, then our position rules out such a visit. And the question of us going there officially is not yet on the order of the day, since no one has invited us to the United States. We, naturally, have no intention of asking for an invitation. We have our pride, and will never impose ourselves as guests on anyone, we have never done so.

I. Vorobyov, correspondent of the Moscow newspaper *Trud*, asked: What are the prospects for expansion of trade between the Soviet Union and Finland? Can the Soviet Union help Finland in the matter of industrializing her northern regions?

Khrushchov: In our opinion trade and business relations between Finland and the Soviet Union are developing successfully and I think that the prospects, far from deteriorating, will be even better. We hold that the best way to ensure world peace is to develop business and trade relations to the utmost. That is our principle—both for us and for the countries with which we trade.

Our relations with Finland, I would say, are developing very well, successfully.

As for aid in industrializing the northern regions of Finland, this question was not raised in the talks between representatives of our states. Since we favour the development of business relations, expansion of trade, we do not rule out the possibility of it being discussed—should it arise—and of a mutually advantageous solution being found. We are ready to give such aid.

We realize that Finland needs to develop her economy in order to satisfy the requirements of the population more fully, so that there should be no unemployment, so that the state should function normally and ensure a high standard of living for the people.

Roberti, correspondent of the *Corriere della Sera*, asked: How do you assess the reaction to the interview you granted to the Columbia Broadcasting System?

Khrushchov: I think that in the main the reaction was good and correct, because the questions raised concerned the nations and the interests of peace, which is desired by all peoples. Naturally, the reaction of all who heard and saw the interview could not be identical.

Ordinary people, those who live by their own labour, reacted very well. They want speedy understanding among the nations and lasting peace throughout the world. Those who are amassing profits from the cold war fear peace, because peace necessitates reconversion of their industry. Instead of making military planes, guns, atomic and hydrogen bombs, they would have to make machines for the manufacture of peaceful commodities—footwear, clothing, houses—in a word to produce everything man needs. But they betray no desire to do so, and their reaction was, of course, adverse. But, aware that the working people are the overwhelming majority of the population they, for this reason, did not publicly express their negative attitude. Now, however, they are gradually beginning to distort the meaning of the interview in order to continue the cold war policy and make more profits from the misfortunes of the people. Still, I think that things will not go the way they want. Sooner or later, the people, fighting persistently, will achieve their purpose and the others will have to heed the voice of the people. The sole object of the interview was to further the aspirations of the working people, of those who live by their labour, who want peace, not war.

N. Polyakov, *Izvestia* correspondent, asked: What measures, in your opinion, are needed to consolidate peace and security in Northern Europe?

Khrushchov: Given the desire to do good for mankind, the good could be initiated in any part of the world—North, South, East and West.

What is needed? What are the peoples waiting for? Peace, peace and again peace. Consequently, the peoples in the North, too, should make their contribution. We think that Finland adheres to this standpoint and that she is doing everything she can, everything necessary for peace. We are somewhat disturbed by the policy of Norway and Denmark. Sweden is a neutral country, but even there voices are raised at times which do not promote an easing of tension. In Norway and Denmark there are fairly influential forces clinging hard to the policy of dividing countries into military blocs and, what is more, wishing to stay in the NATO military alignment. This attitude can bring nothing but harm to these countries and to world peace.

It is particularly dangerous when these countries allow their territories to be used by other states for military bases. We know that talks are under way about the stationing of rocket weapons in Norway and Denmark. But, as they say, God grant that the statesmen of these countries will find sufficient courage to refrain from these bad things which bode nothing good either to these or other countries and cannot further realization of humanity's aspirations, i.e., consolidation of world peace.

My friend Nikolai Alexandrovich Bulganin and I are optimists. For our part, we are doing, and will continue to do, everything to develop friendly relations with the northern countries: Norway, Denmark and Sweden. What a fine thing it would be if from here, from these frigid geographical points, heat were to spread all over the world and warm the hearts of men, so that they could live and breathe in peace without fear of war. This is what we are striving for.

The correspondent of the West German radio asked: What, if any, are the possibilities of rapprochement between the U S S R and the United States of America on the question of German unification?

Khrushchov: That is a rather strange question, all the more so seeing that it comes from a German. For the United States of America and the Soviet Union to settle the

German question—we do not conceive the issue in that way.

We have no desire to meet anyone on the German question. We have repeatedly stated, and reiterate now, that the issue can be resolved only by the Germans themselves, and that there is no need for others to poke their noses into it. The Germans themselves are perfectly capable of handling and settling it in keeping with their interests.

There are two Germanies. And he who has not forgotten how to think realistically cannot get away from the reality. Hence, the Germans themselves will have to reach agreement. I think that they will do so without fail, that they will find a solution satisfactory both to West Germany and East Germany. And we, for our part, if anything depends on us, will be ready to do everything to promote a solution, but not by way of interference, not by negotiations behind the backs of the Germans, and not even with big countries. This smacks of the old methods when the Big Powers decided the destinies of small countries, all the more so since Germany does not belong to the category of small countries. The times have changed. The Germans themselves must settle the matter. We have no desire to go anywhere or receive anyone on this issue. The question must be settled by the Germans themselves.

**SPEECH
AT A MEETING OF WELCOME
IN MOSCOW UPON RETURN
FROM FINLAND**

June 14, 1957

Dear Comrades,

Today after a week in Finland we have returned to our own capital.

The visit was an extremely interesting and useful one. It was a visit of genuine friendship which is growing and becoming stronger between our countries and yielding good fruit both to the Soviet Union and to the Finnish Republic.

Finland is a relatively small country. Nature has not lavished on her fertile soil or mineral riches. Much diligence was needed by the people to develop their own industry and agriculture. And the people of Finland are truly diligent and industrious. During our stay in the country we saw what had been created by the unremitting efforts of the Finnish workers, peasants and intellectuals. Their successes in agriculture and in a number of branches of industry, and their national culture.

We, the envoys of the Soviet people, were received everywhere with warmth and hospitality, as good friends. It was a truly touching reception. We had expected that we would be well received. Not that we were anything out of the ordinary. No. Behind us are the people, the great people of our great peace-loving country. And we are the servants of the people, the executors of their will, that is

why we had anticipated a good reception. But what we saw and experienced in Finland surpassed our expectations. The Finns, who are said to be somewhat sombre and sullen, gave us a hearty welcome.

We visited industrial establishments in Helsinki, Lahti and Tampere, a farmer's homestead, a vocational school in Lahti and the Kaleva boarding school. The meeting organized by the Finland-Soviet Union Society turned into a remarkable demonstration of friendship.

Comrades, I would like to say a few words specially about this society. Finland is perhaps the only non-socialist country in which a society for friendship with the Soviet Union is not in opposition to the government; on the contrary, the statesmen of the country work with it and support it. The late President Paasikivi was its honorary Chairman. And present at the meeting that we attended were President Kekkonen, Mr. Fagerholm, Speaker of Diet, Prime Minister Sukselainen, Cabinet Ministers, Members of Diet and other prominent personalities. I mention this in particular because it testifies to the high prestige enjoyed by the society in Finland, and that the leaders of the country are at one with their people in strengthening friendly relations with the Soviet Union. President Kekkonen's presence at this meeting will benefit the society and further friendship between Finland and the Soviet Union. (*Applause.*) Madame Kilpi, M.S., President of the Society and Member of the Diet, is doing much to further friendship between the two countries. (*Applause.*)

We also attended a festival arranged by the Central Council of Trade Unions at the Olympic Stadium, Helsinki, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the founding of trade unions in Finland. We also visited some paper mills.

Our visit to the Lenin Museum in Tampere made an indelible impression. We were particularly moved by the thoughtfulness and love of the Finnish workers in preserv-

ing everything associated with V. I. Lenin, our great leader and teacher.

Before our departure the Finnish Government presented to the Soviet people the locomotive, No. 293, on which Lenin, when evading the persecution of the Kerensky government, travelled to Finland and later, in October 1917, returned to revolutionary Petrograd. (*Applause.*)

We, with emotion, accepted this historic locomotive And on your behalf, on behalf of the entire Soviet people, I wish to express here sincere and profound gratitude to the Government and people of Finland for this priceless gift. (*Prolonged applause*)

Comrades, the Finnish workers, peasants and intellectuals displayed great interest in our visit to their country. We cannot forget the warm and really friendly meetings with the people in the industrial centres of Lahti and Tampere. In Helsinki many workers requested us to convey fraternal greetings to the workers of the Soviet Union, to tell about their love and friendship. The day we left two delegations of workers from petroleum selling agencies and three building firms came to see us

I avail myself of this opportunity to carry out the request of the Finnish workers and, to the workers of our capital and in their person all Soviet workers, I transmit friendly greetings from the workers of Finland. (*Stormy applause*)

As regards our talks with Finnish statesmen, I must say that they were held in a spirit of mutual understanding, frankness and genuine friendship. It was fine to see that the good-neighbour relations between our countries are steadily growing and developing.

We did not talk about establishing friendly relations Such relations already exist. The talk was about continually developing and strengthening this friendship for the good of our peoples, for peace. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We spoke about expanding trade, cultural and scientific ties between our countries, and, on all questions, both in the matter of Soviet-Finnish relations and in assessing

major questions of international policy, we established identity of views. We recall with particular pleasure the warm meetings and talks with such a prominent personality in Finnish life as President Kekkonen

The outcome of our meetings is excellently summed up in the joint Soviet-Finnish Communiqué published yesterday and in the statement made by Nikolai Alexandrovich Bulganin.

In a word, we are highly pleased with the results of our meetings and talks. Yet another step has been taken along the road of strengthening confidence between our countries, along the road of consolidating peace and security of the nations.

Long live friendship between the Soviet Union and Finland! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live peace throughout the world! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

**INTERVIEW GIVEN
TO TOMOO HIROOKA,
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
OF THE *ASAHI SHIMBUN***

June 18, 1957

(Transcript)

Hirooka: I am very grateful to you for receiving me, though you are so busy. Allow me to put to you a number of questions which interest the Japanese public.

The first question I would like to ask is as follows.

As regards a meeting of the heads of the Great Powers, evidently you are of the opinion that at the present moment a suitable situation for such a meeting has not developed as yet. But the destructive power of nuclear weapons is growing steadily, A- and H-bomb tests increasingly contaminate the atmosphere and the threat to all of mankind is mounting. In this connection voices demanding a reduction of international tension and consolidation of peace resound ever louder. I assume that in response to the insistent demand of world opinion the Great Powers should exert every effort to reach agreement among themselves.

I would like to get your opinion on this question.

Khrushchov: We understand the sentiments of the people in all countries, their anxiety, and their desire to find a way to escape war. In present-day conditions war will be an atomic war with all its consequences. We, for our part, are bending every effort to avoid war, to uphold world peace. We have made proposals to ban nuclear weapons,

but so far all of our proposals have not met with an appropriate response among our partners

We know that the peoples of all countries want peace. But I think that the masses of the people are still inadequately alive to the war danger and are insufficiently active in the struggle to avert war. If the masses understand the full danger of war and act accordingly, it will be possible to compel militarist groups in different countries to consent to an agreement with the object of averting war and strengthening peace

What could be done now concretely?

A few months ago I already told it to your ambassador Mr. Kadowaki in a conversation precisely on the question of banning nuclear weapon tests. You put a similar question to me. But why? When the Soviet Union submitted to the United Nations a proposal on the immediate prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, the Japanese delegate did not support our proposal, he did not vote for it. A strange stand, is it not? But we know that this strange inconsistent position of the Japanese side is explained not by a change in the opinion of the Japanese who yearn for peace, but by the pressure the Americans are bringing to bear on the Japanese. Evidently, the dependence of the Japanese Government on the United States is still strong, and the stand of the United States is well known.

It is true that voices of peace supporters, of fighters for peace, ring out with greater force. Nothing can be achieved without struggle. It is necessary to struggle. We are willing to discontinue atomic and hydrogen weapon tests. We agree. But we are not supported. The United States and Britain put up new conditions and reservations endlessly. The peoples are demanding a stop to A- and H-bomb tests ever more insistently.

We, for our part, understand you very well. We know that the Japanese people were the first to suffer the horrors of atomic attack. We, therefore, understand your anxiety

over the arms race, particularly the race in atomic and hydrogen weapons.

We shall do everything to avoid a recurrence of this, to avoid atomic and thermonuclear war. You may rest assured of our peaceful aspirations, of our full-hearted desire to avoid atomic war, any war in general.

As for a conference of the Heads of Government of the Great Powers, we are willing to meet anywhere, with anyone, if such a conference will help to settle the question preoccupying the peoples.

Hirooka Since we are on the subject of atomic weapons, permit me to ask you the following question.

Japan has no atomic weapons, and, moreover, is the only country which has been the direct object of atomic bombing. By virtue of this fact we Japanese, speaking on the prohibition of nuclear weapons, are not bound by anything and our voice carries moral weight. In this connection I would like first of all to ask you a question about prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. Japan has already sent a proposal on prohibition of A- and H-bomb tests to the Soviet Union, America and Britain, but has not received the answer desired.

But people throughout the world, including the population of the countries possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons, are voicing ever more insistently their alarm over the contamination of the air as a result of experimental explosions. I think that the country which is the first to actually stop the tests will gain moral prestige. It may be assumed that a declaration by the Soviet Union, stating that it, striving to achieve international agreement on prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, unilaterally discontinues these tests for a definite period, could produce a tremendous positive effect. What is your opinion?

Khrushchov: In view of your question I first of all want to clarify one point. You said that Japan appealed to three Powers, namely, the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain, but did not get the answer desired from any of

these Powers. This is inexact. The Soviet Union responded to the appeal of Japan and proposed that A- and H-bomb tests be stopped at once. So, it is wrong to say that we did not respond to Japan's appeal. We now, too, notwithstanding the refusal of the Western countries, as before, stand for discontinuing nuclear weapon tests. We have proposed to the Western powers to suspend atomic weapon tests for two or three years, i.e., to reach a temporary agreement, having in view to turn this temporary agreement into a permanent one. Thus, we long ago went on record in favour of ending the tests and made concrete proposals on this question even prior to the appeal of the Japanese Parliament.

As to your suggestion that the Soviet Union unilaterally discontinue tests, I can say the following

Picture to yourself the following situation the Soviet Union makes a statement on stopping nuclear weapon tests unilaterally, but the other countries which also possess these weapons do not respond to our move and continue the tests. The Soviet Union naturally will fall behind, while its partners will in the meantime try to rush ahead.

Having achieved nothing, we after a certain time will be compelled to resume the tests. What will be the result? The arms race will be intensified and will assume still greater proportions.

Thus, a unilateral statement by the Soviet side would not produce constructive results but, on the contrary, would only encourage the aggressors.

There is one more argument in favour of our position. Last year we unilaterally cut the strength of our armed forces by 1,800,000 men. Our Western partners, however, did not agree to follow our example. The Soviet Union's proposals, aimed at ending the arms race and relieving the international strain, so far have not met with a due response. The Western powers are employing procrastination tactics and are trying to reduce our proposals to naught. Therefore, your considerations concerning a unilat-

eral statement by the Soviet Union on the ending of tests cannot be regarded as substantiated

I think, it would be better to follow another path. The Soviet Union has already stated that it is prepared to discontinue tests. Let us pool our efforts. Let us, for example, act as follows: the Soviet Union and Japan will sign some kind of a joint document on this question. Then this move will be supported by other countries. I am confident that India will accede to such a document. There is no doubt that such a move will be supported by the People's Republic of China, by all the socialist countries. There need be no doubt that also the former dependent countries which have cast off the colonial yoke and have neither the desire nor the possibility of producing and testing A- and H-bombs, will join their voice to this undertaking.

A kind of a united front would thus be created of countries fighting for the discontinuation of nuclear weapon tests, for ending the arms race, for peaceful coexistence. Let such a movement spread among the states and it will lead us to the attainment of our goal.

As for international inspection, should the need of such inspection be recognized, the Soviet Union is ready to agree to it, although even without inspection it is impossible to conceal a single test of A- and H-bombs. Any atomic explosion becomes known even without inspection thanks to contemporary science and technology. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union, wishing to facilitate the solution of this problem, agrees to the setting up of control posts on the territory of the U.S.S.R., as well as in America, Britain, Canada, in different parts of the world, wherever necessary.

We will agree to this in order that no one should be able to test atomic and hydrogen weapons covertly or overtly.

Hirooka: I fully agree that public opinion has power. But a statement by Japan, India, China, the socialist countries, and the former colonies can hardly produce the

needed effect. After all, these countries have no nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons must be renounced by the Great Powers possessing these weapons. If the Soviet Union is the first to set an example and discontinues the tests, the public in America and Britain will raise their voice and press their governments to respond to the initiative of the Soviet side.

Khrushchov. I appreciate the nobility of your ideas, Mr. Hirooka, I respect, and believe in, the sincerity of your words. But I beg you not to forget the times we live in. We live in rigorous times. Different systems exist in the world. Who, for example, could suppose that Eden, the selfsame Eden, and Selwyn Lloyd, whom we met in the spring of last year in London, Guy Mollet and Pineau who came here as our guests, could unleash aggressive war against Egypt? By the way, Messrs. Guy Mollet and Pineau call themselves Socialists. Did Egypt threaten Britain and France? Egypt concentrated on freeing herself from foreign dependence, on getting rid of economic bondage, because without economic independence there is no political independence either. Could this be the reason why Britain and France, and Israel in league with them, attacked Egypt? No. But these countries did attack Egypt. Why, this is the real law of the jungle. I am strong, you are weak, hence you must obey me.

Similarly, in our case. If we, for example, discontinue the tests, we will weaken our defensive might to some extent or another. But it is precisely with our might that we restrain the forces of war and strengthen the forces of peace. Will not a certain weakening of our might spur on the imperialist forces to take a gambling step? This circumstance can encourage them. It is a fact that the American General Norstad, commander of the NATO armed forces, made recently a bellicose statement that the Soviet Union could be destroyed within several hours. Such hot and reckless heads do exist, and we must not forget about them. We do not want to resemble a lambkin

which is defenceless in face of a wolf Both the lambkin and the wolf live in one world. But the wolf, being the stronger, devours the lambkin. We do not want to be in the position of a lambkin. We need fangs so that the wolves should know that an attack on peaceable countries will not remain unpunished. The wolves may lose their skin and even more than that, their head.

I want you, Mr Hirooka, to understand me right. We have done, and shall do, everything to strengthen peace the world over. The Soviet people, as all peoples, strive for peace. But we think that we must act in this respect rationally, and not in a way that people should think that we are making peaceful steps because we are weak. We have made the first step as regards prohibition of nuclear weapons. But what steps in response do we see? Look at what is happening now in London, where the Sub-Committee of the UN Disarmament Commission is meeting. The Soviet representative has made there clear-cut and unambiguous proposals. It would seem, why should not the delegates of France, Britain and the United States accept the Soviet Union's proposals? No. They sit around and sip tea It would be fine if the Soviet Union's proposals were supported The peoples of France, Britain, and the United States, as the peoples of all the other countries, would meet with approval such a decision and would heave a sigh of relief. But the representatives of the Western countries do not agree to this And meanwhile the production of A- and H-bombs continues and small cliques of influential men wax fat on this race.

The imperialist circles of the Western countries, the United States in the first place, want to establish their world domination. Will the Americans withdraw from Japan voluntarily? No. They sit there and suck the Japanese people's lifeblood. They will never withdraw from Japan voluntarily. They sit there and frighten you with the Soviet Union, frighten you with A- and H-bombs.

Hirooka: We, Japanese, are the only nation which suffered three times from atomic and hydrogen weapons. That is why we react very keenly to this question. I understand very well your argument and regret that my suggestion about unilateral discontinuation of A- and H-bomb tests cannot be supported by you.

Allow me to express the wish—all Japanese will support me in this—that the Soviet Union take all measures for reaching agreement to outlaw the manufacture of atomic and nuclear weapons and to stop their tests.

Khrushchov. We, for our part, shall do everything, we shall not slacken our efforts to achieve this goal. And I am confident, it will be achieved. Common sense is on the side of the peoples who are demanding a ban on nuclear weapons. It is becoming harder for the imperialists to ignore the demands of the peoples. As the forces of peace grow, the small clique of men who make fortunes on the manufacture of A- and H-bombs will find it harder and harder to engage in their sinister business.

Hirooka: Nuclear weapons have taken the most important place in the armaments of the United States and the U.S.S.R. In view of this it is becoming increasingly difficult to separate prohibition of nuclear weapons from a general reduction of armaments. The United States, apparently, holds that the existence of powerful armed forces, equipped with nuclear weapons, prevents war and helps to preserve peace. What is the viewpoint of the Soviet side on this question?

Khrushchov: We do not share this view. It is the view held by men of war and not by men of peace. The point is that in present conditions the power of weapons can grow infinitely. There are no limits to technique today. Science can create ever more destructive types of weapons. But this is a very expensive business. The United States, for example, is already spending two-thirds of its budget for military purposes. The people are groaning under the weight of the tax burden.

We must also bear in mind that when weapons are stockpiled, some men may be tempted: why not use these weapons? The hotheads are beginning to think: is it not time to start a shooting war? We know that stockpiling of arms has never strengthened peace, history testifies to this.

We must not be guided by the law of the jungle, by the rules: he who is strong shall dictate his will to others. We live in different times.

The world has many blessings so that the peoples could live in peace and the states could coexist peacefully. For this there is no need to stockpile weapons, no need to engage in an arms race. Consequently, the view presented in your question is the philosophy—if it might be called a philosophy—of robbers. The peoples must not be kept in endless fear of war, must not be subordinated to the whims of rabid militarists. There must be no fortune-making on A- and H-bombs. We must not allow some accident to precipitate war which would result in the annihilation of millions of people and the destruction of material values created by the labour of man. The rules of the jungle must not be turned into law, nor must there be any actions in accordance with these rules. The peoples want peace and tranquillity, they do not want war.

Hirooka: I fully agree with you that the arms race must be stopped. Possession of nuclear weapons increases the war danger. In connection with the war in Egypt, Mr. Bulganin sent well-known letters which contained a threat of using atomic weapons against the United States, Britain and France. It turns out that the Soviet side, too, uses these weapons for intimidation.

Khrushchov: To begin with, I want to draw attention to an inaccuracy contained in your question, Mr. Hirooka. First, in general no threats whatsoever were contained in the letter sent by the Soviet Government to the Governments of Britain and France, second, it is a fact that the Soviet Government proposed to the United States to come

out jointly for the cessation of hostilities in Egypt and to try and defend the interests of Egypt, relying on the United Nations Charter.

In our letters to D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, A. Eden, Prime Minister of Great Britain, Guy Mollet, President of the Council of Ministers of France, and Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel, we argued the unjustness of the aggression unleashed by Britain, France and Israel, exposed them of attacking Egypt because she was weak. We pointed then to the position Britain and France would be in if they were attacked by other states possessing modern means of warfare. It was pointed out that nowadays it was not absolutely necessary to send a fleet or troops to one or another country, it would be possible to act from a distance, using, for example, rockets. We appealed to their reason and their conscience. We by no means threatened to use nuclear weapons.

Our statement had a due effect on Britain and France. The letters of N. A. Bulganin were dispatched on November 5, approximately at 11 p.m., Moscow time. And a day later a cease-fire in Egypt was already declared. The peoples of Britain and France condemned the aggressive war against Egypt and influenced the Governments of their countries. This cease-fire in Egypt was effected in time. Otherwise, the war in Egypt could have grown over into a big war and turn then into a world war.

Our statement, thus, played an important part in ending the war in Egypt. This role, no doubt, will be positively assessed by history.

Hirooka: I understood this well. Now I would like to go over to the question of Japanese-Soviet relations.

I wholeheartedly wish for the establishment of genuine confidence and friendship between the peoples of Japan and the U.S.S.R. Both sides, however, will have to exert much effort in this direction. Frankly speaking, many Japanese still continue to harbour strong suspicions and apprehensions with regard to the Soviet Union. For

example, in the late war the Soviet Union, opening hostilities against Japan, undoubtedly acted contrary to the neutrality pact concluded between Japan and the Soviet Union. It is not surprising that the Japanese were prejudiced against the Soviet Union and found it risky to rely on its promises. The Soviet-Chinese pact of friendship and alliance and the activities of Communists in Japan also arouse apprehensions among Japanese. I think that all the things that hinder the establishment of friendship between Japan and the U.S.S.R. ought to be eliminated one after another. In this connection I would like to get clarification on the following matters.

1. The Soviet-Chinese treaty of friendship and alliance speaks unambiguously about Japan as the potential adversary. This circumstance disturbs the peaceful Japanese people to no little extent. You know very well that present-day Japan has neither the desire nor the possibilities to commit aggression against other countries. Do you consider it possible to introduce appropriate modifications in the Soviet-Chinese treaty of friendship and alliance?

2. The Soviet Union undertook in the Japanese-Soviet Joint Declaration not to interfere in the domestic affairs of Japan in any way. What is meant is not only direct interference, but also indirect. But many Japanese have the apprehension. Does not the Soviet Union impose communist ideas on them, acting through the Communist Party of Japan? These apprehensions were aroused by the practical activities of the Japanese Communists. How do you assess these apprehensions of the Japanese?

Khrushchov: I fully understand your anxiety. But if we are to speak of the past relations between our countries, they are very complex. The fact that the Soviet Union came out against Japan in the late war must not be regarded in isolation from the preceding history of the relations between our countries. You say that the U.S.S.R. acted contrary to the neutrality pact. But recall how Japan attacked Port Arthur in 1904, attacked without a dec-

laration of war and without any warning. Having scored victory over tsarist Russia, Japan, a young imperialist state at that time, also captured Korea. This is what happened in those times.

Now let us turn to the other times. When the Great October Socialist Revolution took place in our country what did Japan do? Without any warning, she landed troops in Vladivostok and seized a large territory of our country. This occupation continued for several years. And only because the Russian people, all peoples of our country, rose to fight for their freedom and independence and struck crushing blows at the interventionists, were the Japanese invaders compelled to clear out of the Far East. This attack on the young Soviet Republic was undertaken by Japan simultaneously with Britain, France, America and other countries which pursued obviously imperialist ends. In those years the Japanese diplomats behaved themselves very arrogantly with regard to the Russians. I do not know how this is called in the language of diplomats, but I will use the word impudence in speaking about the behaviour of the Japanese consul in Vladivostok. This consul told the Chairman of the Primorye Executive Committee Butsenko:

"Why do you sit here? This land is large, you use it poorly. Get out! Otherwise we will chase you out."

We had to suffer that at the time. But all this left its imprint. Moreover, not only words were spoken then. Recall at least such actions as the attack of Japanese troops on our country in the Lake Khasan area. Then Japan launched her aggression against China, seized a big part of Chinese territory and began to draw near to Mongolia. What did the Japanese papers write in those days? Mr. Hirooka himself probably remembers. The Japanese papers wrote that Japan should extend her frontiers up to Lake Baikal and even up to the Urals. Carrying out this plan, Japan fell upon the Mongolian People's Republic. The Soviet Union, living up to its obligations under the treaty,

rendered aid to that country. Battles near Khalkhin-Gol were fought. The Soviet troops were commanded then by G. K. Zhukov. That war claimed a big toll of our people and the Japanese!

If the Japanese militarists failed at that time to carry out their plans for an advance up to Lake Baikal it was not because their conscience did not allow them to do so, but because they lacked the forces, because they received a crushing rebuff. Only because of that.

Recall also that Japan joined in the anti-Comintern pact with Hitler Germany and fascist Italy, the notorious Berlin-Rome-Tokyo "axis" was formed and it was spear-headed against us. At that time Japan was a typically imperialist state. She captured huge territories of China, the most vital centres of that country. And if Japan attacked the United States, and not us, that was done in accordance with the calculations of the Japanese General Staff: they planned first to crush China and the United States and then to swoop down upon the Soviet Union after we would be bled white in the war against Hitler Germany. There was understanding between Japan and Germany that the Japanese-German frontier was to run across the Urals. This was spoken of at the time by Goebbels, by Hitler himself and by the German military associates of Hitler.

That is why we could not afford to be naïve and figure that we would succeed in cooling the ardour of the imperialist states. We were the allies of the United States, Britain and France in the Second World War. We routed the fascist forces jointly. We tested our allies in action and had more grounds for trusting them than Japan, which proceeded from her own calculations and had not attacked us only because our turn had not come up as yet, and not because Japan wanted to be loyal to her obligations.

If one is to speak on the subject of morals and reproach the Soviet side for violating the pact, recall what moral right Japan had to attack Russia in 1904 or to intervene

after the Revolution, what moral right Japan had to attack us in the Lake Khasan area and our ally in the Khalkhin-Gol area, to put forward slogans about advancing up to the Urals, to engineer armed clashes on our frontiers all the time, stationing in Manchuria its strong Kwantung army. What moral right did Japan have to do all these things?

During the Second World War, as is known, Japan was an ally of Hitler Germany and fascist Italy. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, was an ally of America and Britain. It trusted its allies more. And when Hitler Germany was routed the Soviet Union discharged its allied duty, coming out against militarist Japan. This in no way was perfidy with regard to the Japanese people.

Thus, this question must be examined on a broad plane and not in isolation from the entire preceding history of our relations.

It should also be recalled that the neutrality pact between our countries was denounced by the Soviet side in conformity with the provisions contained in Article Three of the pact. I must add to this that during the war of the Soviet Union against Hitler Germany, Japan blockaded the Far East, cut our communication lines, captured and sunk Soviet ships and thus, in fact, herself reduced the neutrality pact to naught.

Now as to the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance. Yes, this treaty has a clause which says that the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China jointly "shall take all measures at their disposal necessary to prevent a recurrence of aggression and violation of the peace by Japan or any other state which, directly or indirectly, would unite with Japan in acts of aggression."

As for the Soviet Union, it is ready to discuss this matter. But for this the necessary conditions must be created. Upon whom does the creation of such conditions depend? The creation of conditions making it possible to

change the formulation in the Soviet-Chinese treaty depends chiefly on Japan. She must display good will and first of all recognize people's China. Why has Japan not recognized the People's Republic of China so far? Is it possible that she wants to attack it? But Japan knows that if she attacks China, we, in accordance with the treaty, shall come to the aid of China. And the People's Republic of China will come to our aid if Japan attacks us.

Recognition of the People's Republic of China and the Korean People's Democratic Republic is in the interests of Japan herself. She has to develop friendship with her neighbours. Recognize the P.R.C. and the K.P.D.R., develop trade relations with them and then the conditions will change, and it will be possible to alter the formulation in the treaty as well.

I speak only on behalf of our side and do not intend to speak on behalf of the People's Republic of China. But I think our Chinese friends will concur. We would like to have a friendly Japan next to us. And this would be fortunate for both sides. Our economic interests do not clash with the economic interests of Japan. But with America your interests do clash, because you are its competitor. You will have no competition with us, however. We can sell you, coal, ore, timber, oil and other raw materials. The People's Republic of China is a huge country which can also sell you raw materials and buy the products of your industry.

Why does not Japan do things that are to her advantage? She does not do them because she is dependent on the United States. Legally, she is considered independent, but actually, in reality, she is forced to reckon with America which stands with its soldier's jackboot in Japan. Your Prime Minister, Mr. Kishi, after touring the South-East Asian countries, has now gone to the United States. I read in the papers that Mr. Kishi will conduct negotiations in the United States. But he will conduct negotiations not as an equal partner, for Japan is in an unequal position.

I think Japan will not tolerate such a position for long. She will seek to have real, and not fictitious, sovereignty. And we hope that this will come about soon. Japan will regain her genuine, real sovereignty.

As for the activities of the Japanese Communist Party, all complaints should be presented not to us, but rather to Marx who created the scientific theory of social development. Marx demonstrated that a new system, communism, would inevitably take the place of capitalism, just as in the past capitalism took the place of feudalism. Such is the inexorable law of social development. You do not agree with this teaching. You think that the capitalist formation will survive. To think so is your right. We Communists think differently and are convinced that communism will inevitably take the place of capitalism. It is not we who influence the activities of the Japanese Communists, but the Marxist-Leninist teaching. I personally am not acquainted with the secretaries of the Japanese Communist Party, have never met them, but we have common ideas. We are certain that Marxism-Leninism is correct. Ideas cannot be imposed by force. You are a newspaper editor, yours is a bourgeois newspaper. You think that the capitalist system is good. You can freely uphold your opinion. I believe that communism will be victorious in Japan. I am convinced of this because I am a Communist. But when will this victory come? This depends on the Japanese people. I believe in them, in their forces. The Japanese are a persevering people and they will achieve victory. You want the bourgeois system to exist for ever. But what I want is that there should be communism. I sympathize with the Japanese Communists, but we do not allow ourselves any interference in Japanese affairs. Interference in the domestic affairs of other countries brings harm only. Each fruit ripens in due time and depending on the conditions. This is true of revolution as well. The Japanese people themselves have to decide what system they should have. Political struggle in one or another country comes within the domestic affairs

of the given country, there must be no interference from without. But we shall sympathize with the Japanese Communists, because we profess a common idea, a common teaching.

This is how we understand the situation that has developed now.

Hirooka: Questions of relations between our countries will be reflected in history. I do not intend to go in for a discussion of these matters, to dig into the past because this can lead us far afield. Now we have to think how to re-establish confidence between our countries and what measures should be taken in this respect.

Khrushchov: Very well. I like the way the question is put. Let us think of the future, of where we are heading. And here the main thing is trade, the establishment of good-neighbour relations. Take, for example, coal. I think our coal will be cheaper for you than American because we are nearer to you. Foodstuffs and other goods will also be cheaper than American. Do what is more to your advantage economically. Let us act to our mutual benefit. We can buy from you many goods. The People's Republic of China also can be a big consumer of your goods.

Why aren't you developing trade with us and China? Is it not profitable for your capitalists? Is it not profitable for your people? Let us act reasonably. It is necessary to promote cultural and other ties, create the ground for rapprochement in all spheres in order to ensure durable friendly relations. Conclude a peace treaty with us, establish normal relations with the People's Republic of China. All of us—the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, Japan and other countries, such as India, Burma, Indonesia—could sign a joint non-aggression pact. I am not prepared now to make a more concrete proposal. The matter should be thought over, let Japan take some steps, and we will outline concretely what should be done.

Hirooka: I understand you well: it is necessary to develop economic relations. Now I want to go over to the question of fishing in the Northern waters. Japanese fishing boats are quite often detained by the Soviet side. Could not the U.S.S.R., which possesses a vast territory and natural resources, give Japanese fishermen, for whom the fishing grounds in the Northern waters are of vital importance, the opportunity to operate in safer and freer conditions?

Khrushchov: Zones in territorial waters are established by each country—such is the international procedure. We have introduced a 12-mile zone. But such a zone has been established not only by the Soviet Union. Ask your ambassador. He can tell you what other countries have a 12-mile zone. The order established in one or another country must be respected. This applies to Soviet territorial waters as well. As for fishing in free waters, i.e., outside the zone of territorial waters, there is a definite agreement between our countries and it must be adhered to. Here the cardinal principle, by which we should be guided, is as follows. We must not chop down the oak-tree, on which the acorns we need grow. If we act imprudently, we shall destroy the things that serve us and benefit us. We understand the importance of fishing for Japan which has limited food resources. But one more consideration must be borne in mind. It is one thing when a state arrives at a decision, ensuring mutual advantage in the interests of the state. But it is a different matter when some individual fisherman is out to catch fish. He thinks only of himself, of his own benefit. He wants to catch as much fish as possible and thinks little of the future. We must be above that and approach the fishing problem from a state viewpoint, we must act in the common interests.

Hirooka: Allow me to ask the following question.

The Soviet Union promised in the Joint Declaration to continue talks on a peace treaty and to turn over the Habomai and Shikotan islands to Japan after the peace treaty is concluded. But it may be assumed that under the

situation existing at present both islands will not be returned to Japan for a long time.

In the course of the Japanese-Soviet talks, naturally, account had to be taken of different circumstances, but a favourable influence on the development of friendly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union can hardly be exerted by the fact that the Soviet Union will continue to keep for a long time two islands, the ownership of which by Japan was recognized by the U.S.S.R. itself.

Does not the Soviet side intend to turn over the Habomai and Shikotan islands to Japan, separating the question of these islands from the question of the ownership of the Iturup and Kunashir islands, and do you admit the possibility of revising the question of the ownership of the Iturup and Kunashir islands, depending on the international situation?

Khrushchov: I already gave an answer to these questions to Mr. Hatoyama and Mr. Kono when they were in Moscow. We had more than one conversation on this subject. We agreed that a peace treaty should be concluded. Let us do the things we agreed upon. As soon as a peace treaty is concluded, the Habomai and Shikotan islands will at once be turned over to Japan. I do not know what is holding Japan back from concluding a peace treaty. We are lost in surmises.... Why don't you conclude a peace treaty with us, why do you leave our relations in this state? Or, perhaps, you want to start war against us? Who is preventing you from concluding a peace treaty? Forces within the country? Hardly. Within your country there are no forces which would be opposed to a peace treaty. Apparently, outside forces. If we turn over the Habomai and Shikotan islands to you prior to the conclusion of a peace treaty, it will be as though we are helping the outside forces which are impeding the conclusion of a peace treaty. But if tomorrow—by the way, I told this to Mr. Hatoyama as well—if tomorrow the Americans return Okinawa to you, then I would propose to our Government

that we turn over the Habomai and Shikotan islands to Japan prior to the signing of a peace treaty. In my opinion, you are not pressing the United States hard enough for the return of Okinawa Island. As we agreed, we shall return these islands to you only provided a peace treaty is concluded.

As for other islands of the Kuril group, neither you had, nor do we have, any more or less important economic enterprises there. These islands are of no great economic significance for the Soviet Union and for Japan. But they are of great strategic importance. This should be borne in mind. I cannot go beyond the bounds of what was recorded in the Joint Declaration signed by N. A. Bulganin and Mr. Hatoyama. Let us develop friendly relations between our countries, strengthen this friendship.

Hirooka: I would like to ask you a question about the freedom of travel for foreigners within the Soviet Union. Restriction of free movement of foreigners gives rise to all sorts of talk that the U.S.S.R. is a country covered by a shroud of secrecy, and so on, and such talk will merely hinder the development of friendly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union.

Khrushchov: I think that this question is wholly connected with the international situation. The more international tension is lessened, the more freely foreigners will travel. And if we succeed in reaching agreement on disarmament, in achieving full confidence, then probably there would be no serious obstacles to lifting all restrictions in general, not only with regard to travel of foreigners within the Soviet Union, but also their unhindered entry into our country.

Thus, everything depends on the relaxation of international tension. Let us, to begin with, compare the situation in the Soviet Union with the situation in other countries. In the United States, for example, freedom of travel for Soviet people is much more restricted than for Americans in our country.

Hirooka: I would like to ask you about the following. Frankly speaking, we think that the Hungarian events last year were a great misfortune both for the Soviet Union and for Hungary. In connection with this I would like to know how you think to regulate the situation in the future so that no such events should occur. Do you intend to extend the principle of coexistence, which you recognize in relations between socialist and capitalist countries, to relations between states of the communist zone?

Khrushchov: You see, the point is that the events in Hungary are not a characteristic phenomenon. Much was written about it in the press. The mistakes of the former Hungarian leaders were utilized by forces hostile to the socialist system. That is why a situation arose which had adverse consequences both for us and for Hungary. But today full order prevails in Hungary. The people's democratic system is stable, and such events as there were will never recur. Nor will they occur in the other socialist countries, because the Hungarian events were an instructive lesson for all.

Now about the principle of coexistence. In relations with the socialist countries we are guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism, friendship, and fraternal cooperation between the peoples. These principles were re-emphasized with fresh force in the well-known Declaration of October 30, 1956, on non-interference in the domestic affairs of each other.

When we speak of coexistence, we have in mind coexistence of socialist and capitalist states. These forces stand opposite each other, there are antagonistic differences between them. To prevent these contradictions from leading to war coexistence is needed. What is meant is that disputes should not be resolved through war. In brief, the principle of coexistence aims to prevent war.

As for the socialist countries, there are no antagonistic differences between them, no struggle or hostility. Of

course, this does not mean that in relations between them there are no rubs whatsoever. Between friends, too, there can be disputes and discord, divergences on some questions. There can be such disputes even between husband and wife. They can have different views on things.

But between friends there are no basic reasons for hostility and antagonism, nor can there be any. That is why it will hardly be correct to use the word 'coexistence' for relations between socialist states. Relations between them are guided by the principle of friendship and mutual assistance, the principle of proletarian internationalism. We are united by the teaching of Marx, Lenin, the ideas of socialism. And this is much more, much deeper and fuller than the principle of coexistence. We can criticize each other. And this is fully natural. But in any dispute between us the question of war cannot come up. We render each other socialist assistance in developing the economy, culture and science so that each of our countries, all socialist countries should constantly feel mutual support and assistance.

Hirooka. I understood you to mean that peaceful coexistence can be applied in relations between socialist and capitalist countries. As far as I can see, coexistence means that all disputes between these countries can be settled without resorting to force or war.

Khrushchov: Right!

Hirooka: The Hungarian events arose because the leaders there made mistakes. There were disturbances, protests, which, however, were put down by the force of arms.

Khrushchov: Speaking about the conflict which arose in Hungary, it should be noted that at first there were rather inoffensive actions. The student demonstrations, for example, were of such a nature. But these actions, demonstrations and meetings were utilized by counter-revolutionary plotters who set themselves the object of overthrowing the lawful people's government. It was already during the

demonstrations that the plotters handed out weapons secretly to various criminal elements.

Where did the plotters get these weapons from? Not from the government, of course. At first when the counter-revolutionaries came with weapons to the factories, the workers chased them away. But later on the forces of reaction succeeded in making headway, and then the lawful Government of Hungary, approved by the Hungarian Parliament, appealed to us, on the basis of the Warsaw Treaty, to help the Hungarian people.

The question is Did the Hungarian Government have a right to do so? Of course it had, because it was the lawful power elected by the people. But the clique of plotters who handed out weapons to criminal elements—what right did it have to represent the people? None at all. The fascist plotters, having captured weapons, suddenly came to the surface, they organized bloody terror, began to kill the foremost men of the Hungarian people. But the rebels were crushed. Their forces were destroyed and now full tranquillity prevails in Hungary Parliament has expressed its confidence in the Government The factories are working and life is normal.

Could there be tranquil life in the country, if the people were not satisfied with the government, did not recognize it? Then surely there would have been guerilla warfare in the country. The people could not keep silence. Recall the times when the Germans captured almost all of Europe. What was happening in Poland, in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Yugoslavia, France, Greece, Belgium, the Netherlands and other countries? All these countries were occupied by the most powerful army in Europe. But this army could not subdue the peoples, could not break their resistance. All these peoples began to fight fascism and ultimately won victory.

Things are entirely different in Hungary. Go there and travel over the country. You yourself will become convinced that there is full tranquillity. If the socialist system were

hated by the masses could one travel calmly over the country?

We revolutionaries know the power of the people's resistance. There was a time when invaders—Japanese, Americans, British, French and others—operated on the territory of our country. They supported the Whiteguard generals who were fighting against Soviet power. What did our people do? The people rose up against the foreign invaders and internal counter-revolution and routed all their enemies. The inexperienced, poorly equipped Red Army scored victory, because the people followed Lenin, the Bolshevik Party. But the uprising in Hungary was started by fascists who were out to restore the capitalist system. The people were opposed to the return of the fascist order. It was sufficient for us to render some little assistance and the Hungarian people routed the counter-revolutionary forces and restored order in their country.

The Hungarian events are a lesson for all other countries. The peoples of the socialist countries will give the enemies no chance to repeat such events. The main thing is to listen attentively to the voice of the people, not to make mistakes which could upset the relations between the leaders and the people.

We have already proposed to the Western powers that they withdraw their forces from Germany and other countries of Europe and dismantle their military bases with the object of relieving the international strain. The Soviet Union would also withdraw its troops from Germany, Rumania, Poland and Hungary, where they are stationed in conformity with the Warsaw Treaty. Let us withdraw the troops and watch how events will develop. We shall see, first, that the position of the people's democratic governments will be very strong and, second, we shall verify by facts which system of government enjoys greater sympathy with the people.

It is said in bourgeois countries that the socialist governments are maintained in power only by the force of

arms. So we proposed to withdraw the troops in order to see what the situation would be like in the socialist countries and also in West Germany and other countries, from which the foreign troops would be withdrawn. But the United States, Britain and France refuse to do so.

We are convinced that a people cannot be ruled by force only, by keeping the population in fear. We are convinced that the socialist system meets the aspirations of the people. Therefore, power in the socialist countries rests on a strong foundation. We are convinced that sooner or later capitalism will perish, just as feudalism perished in the past. The socialist countries are marching to communism. The whole world will come to communism. History does not ask you whether you want it or not.

We are not afraid to withdraw our troops from all the countries where they are stationed now, but Britain, the United States and France are afraid. The governments of Italy and West Germany are afraid of the withdrawal of foreign troops from their countries. Adenauer, for example, asks that foreign troops be left in West Germany. Why? Because the governments of these countries do not know what will happen to them when the American troops leave. They do not know how the French, Italians, Germans, Greeks and other people will behave. Which means that they have no confidence in themselves, have no confidence in the loyalty of the peoples to the capitalist regime. The truth is on our side. Power is on our side. The power, not of arms, but of ideas, the power of our world outlook. The peoples cannot be subdued by force and kept in fear. One should act reasonably in international affairs. Let the Americans withdraw their troops from Japan; the Japanese people are demanding it. On Taiwan the people are also demanding: "Americans, get out of Taiwan!" Why aren't the Americans withdrawing their troops? They are afraid. That is the whole point. If you are a guest you should know when it is time to leave. If you leave in time, you will be seen out courteously; if, however, you over-stay

your welcome, you will be seen out, but in a different way, you will be given the boot. Invaders sit in your country, for example. They are not guests. They sit on the neck of your people, just as they sit in West Germany and some other countries, just as they sit in Taiwan. But in the long run they will be chased out of there.

Many people in Britain, France and the United States are already saying that it is time to end the stay of foreign troops in other countries. People talk about it more and more frequently. This process has begun and nothing can stop it.

Hirooka: We also say that the presence of foreign troops on the territories of other countries is undesirable. In Japan, too, voices criticizing the United States resound. But at the same time there are apprehensions and some kind of suspicions with regard to the Soviet Union. The Japanese would like the Americans to withdraw from Japan and would like to establish relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of mutual confidence. As for Hungary, I also think that, even in case the Soviet troops are withdrawn, she will not return to capitalism, and since there is such a likelihood, free elections could be held there.

Khrushchov: I agree with you. And there have been free elections in Hungary. The Hungarian Parliament has been elected on a democratic basis. The freest elections are held precisely in the socialist countries. Here everything belongs to the people. But in the United States everything is in the hands of the capitalists. They own the newspapers, radio, cinema, etc. In the United States freedom exists in the sense that everyone can apply for work, but also can find no work, can die from starvation. This is freedom to die. We do not recognize such freedom. Our understanding of freedom is different. We can continue our conversation on this subject, but this would lead us aside. I will gladly meet you again and talk some more.

Hirooka: I want to express to you my warm gratitude for giving me so much time and answering all my questions.

Khrushchov: I am also pleased with the conversation we have had. We sincerely want relations between our countries to develop on a good basis and to grow over into friendly relations. We favour a policy of living in peace and friendship with our neighbours—this is useful not only to both our countries, but also to such a great country as the People's Republic of China, this is useful to other neighbouring countries as well.

We are ready to cooperate with any Japanese Government, if it for its part strives to establish good-neighbour relations between our countries.

Please convey to the industrious Japanese people our greetings and good wishes. We ask you to believe us and to develop peaceful friendly relations with us. Develop friendship also with the People's Republic of China and the other peace-loving peoples.

I want to ask you: By what route did you come to Moscow?

Hirooka: We flew to your country via the North Pole, on planes of the Scandinavian Air Service.

Khrushchov: Why not come to Moscow via Khabarovsk? You and we are neighbours. We long ago proposed to the Japanese leaders to establish direct air service between our countries. I think this would be useful to both our countries. But you, probably, are not allowed to do this by the Americans.

Hirooka: Yes, it would be fine to establish such direct service. It would be useful to exchange mail parcels as well.

Khrushchov: I agree with you. You probably cannot consent to the establishment of direct air service between our countries because your airfields are in the hands of the Americans and you, evidently, have no place where to receive our planes. Isn't this so?

Hirooka As regards airfields, it is not exactly so. We have several airfields where foreign planes land.

Khrushchov: But our planes must not be received! Too bad. We also would like to receive your passenger planes, would like to establish regular air communication between our countries.

Hirooka: I am also in favour of it and think that the establishment of direct air service between the Soviet Union and Japan would be a good thing. I assume that if we want to promote good relations between our countries, it should be possible to settle such a simple matter.

Khrushchov: I agree with you. Of course, such questions, too, should be settled.

Hirooka: I want you to know that I personally am a peace supporter. We in Japan are waging a persistent struggle against those who do not want peace.

Khrushchov: This is fine. We know that the forces fighting for peace are growing in Japan and I heartily wish them success.

Hirooka: The main thing, in my opinion, is not to impose one's ideology on others. Personally I think that if the Japanese people become supporters of the communist ideology, there can be no objection to that. But this must be done by the people themselves voluntarily, without imposing such an ideology on them from the outside.

Khrushchov: We are in favour of this. I agree with you. This is precisely how it should be.

Hirooka: Allow me to thank you once again for this conversation. I thank you.

Khrushchov: It was also a pleasure for me to talk with you. Come to our country again, study life in the Soviet Union.

Hirooka: I will certainly come. Such visits are useful.

Pravda, June 30, 1957

SPEECH^{*}
AT A SOVIET-CZECHOSLOVAK
FRIENDSHIP MEETING
IN OSTRAVA
DURING VISIT OF SOVIET PARTY
AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION
TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA

July 13, 1957

Dear comrades,

Allow me on behalf of the Party and Government Delegation of the Soviet Union to thank you for your warm welcome, for your hospitality and expressions of friendship for our people, for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the socialist gains of the Soviet people. The Soviet people look upon the socialist gains of the Soviet Union not simply as their own personal gains, but as the gains of the working people of the world, of the entire socialist camp. These gains strengthen the world forces of progress and socialism. Our people were the first to take the road indicated by Marx, Engels and Lenin. It so happened that our people were the first to step out along unexplored roads in the struggle for socialism. And we stand before the world as representatives of the first socialist state of working people. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cries: "Long live the Soviet Union!"*)

Hence, our experience, our achievements in socialist construction are not only the property of the Soviet people. We regard ourselves as part of the great international working-class movement, of the world proletariat.

^{*} Abridged —Ed.

That which we did yesterday, you and the peoples of the other socialist countries are doing today. And tomorrow the working people of other countries will take to this road. Marx's famous call, "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" is assuming flesh and blood (*Prolonged applause. Cries: "Hurrah!" "Long live friendship!"*)

We are among friends here. Many bourgeois newspapers and journals have sent their correspondents who are travelling with us, accompanying us on this tour. These correspondents write in different ways, in the ways they understand things. But the secret is that not everyone rightly assesses what he sees, just as not everyone can gaze at the heavens and see the sun as it really is. (*Applause. Cries: "Hurrah!"*)

Many bourgeois correspondents cannot, and do not want to, explain correctly why the peoples of Czechoslovakia extend such a hospitable welcome to the representatives of the Soviet Union. Well, then, what is the explanation for the hearty welcome accorded us in every city and town? Our pictures are nothing out of the ordinary, there is nothing in them that would make anyone particularly enthusiastic. Just plain people, like the millions throughout the world. What, then, is the secret? Wherein lies our appeal? It is that we are representatives of the Soviet Union, the country where power is in the hands of the working people, where labour has triumphed and where there is but one privilege—he who works better is honoured best by society. (*Stormy applause.*)

The new, socialist society, a society in which labour rules, has been established in our country. As Soviet people, we are proud to have been the first to enter into the kingdom of labour, where he who works is honoured and esteemed and where he who lives on another man's labour is an object of contempt. (*Stormy applause. Cries. "Long live the Soviet Union!"*)

Heavy industry is well developed in your town and in its environs. It gives me pleasure to see here men of my

own trade—miners. My father was a miner and I myself worked in a pit, so I know what mining is. We can find a common tongue. There is no stronger friendship than that between the workers. The most friendly relations exist between the workers and all the working people of our two countries. There is firm friendship between the Soviet miners—Russians, Ukrainians and other nationalities of the U.S.S.R.—and the miners of Czechoslovakia, whose ranks include Czechs, Slovaks, Poles and other nationalities. There is no reason why we shouldn't maintain these relations of brotherhood since we are fighting for a common cause. That is why the industrial workers and all the working people of Czechoslovakia are so cordial and hospitable towards us. Ties of fraternal kinship link our iron and steel workers, engineering workers, and all the workers in Moscow, the Urals, the Ukraine, Siberia and other industrial centres of our country. And for you, our Czechoslovak friends, they entertain sincere friendship.

We should help each other. And should anyone seek to disturb the peaceful labours of the peoples of the Soviet Union and of our friends—Czechoslovaks, Chinese, Poles, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Albanians, and the peoples of the other countries of the socialist camp—then we shall administer a fitting rebuff.

We say: You, good sirs, see the brink, but don't overstep it, walk in the vicinity, but don't look down. (*Stormy applause.*)

Our people, like your people, want peace. This is the desire of the peoples of all countries who live by their own labour, and we are doing everything to ensure peaceful labour for the people (*Applause.*)

We have submitted concrete proposals for disarmament, we have suggested banning the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons and their manufacture, banning tests of atomic weapons. We have proposed a reduction in armaments to be followed by complete disarmament. We are doing everything so that we can live in peace and friendship

with all countries. We are for peaceful coexistence. But our Western partners are, as yet, unwilling to come to terms with us.

The thought has just struck me: the bourgeois press will again tear me to shreds, they will say that in Czechoslovakia Khrushchov has reverted to disarmament. But can one help talking about it?

There is a special UN Disarmament Sub-Committee, now sitting in London. This Sub-Committee is regarded as a UN agency. But count the countries represented on this Sub-Committee and you will find that it could be described much more properly as a NATO sub-committee, because apart from the Soviet Union it does not have a single country that is not a member of NATO. So you can imagine how difficult it is to reach agreement on disarmament there.

The imperialists want NATO for aggressive purposes. They seek the destruction of the Soviet system, the destruction of democracy and people's rule in Czechoslovakia, people's China, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria and in the other socialist countries. In fact, they plainly say so: we will not leave you in peace until you are "freed" from communism. (*Laughter.*) Money is officially assigned for this purpose in the U.S. state budget. You are aware, I take it, that the U.S. Government appropriates over 100 million dollars annually for propaganda and subversion against us.

On the UN Disarmament Sub-Committee you will find the U.S.A., Britain, France and Canada—all of them members of NATO. How is it possible to reach agreement on disarmament with representatives of countries whose governments do not want to disarm? Things would be different if the Sub-Committee included representatives of the countries whose ruling circles really want peace. If these countries, the peoples themselves, were to take the cause of peace into their own hands, then world peace would be assured. We, on our part, are ready to do every-

thing to prevent war from breaking out. (*Stormy applause. Cries: "Long live peace!" "Hurrah!"*)

At a meeting in a Prague factory I expressed my views on what President Eisenhower said about the "clean" bomb. Then I read that some American quarters had expressed surprise at Khrushchov taking a dim view of their efforts to make such a bomb.

But what else could I say, since I couldn't qualify them as good efforts, as efforts designed to strengthen peace.

We say we are against war, against the slaughter of man by man. We want to ban the manufacture and use of A- and H-bombs. We are for cutting the armed forces. We want complete disarmament. This is an effort that everyone, the literate and even illiterate, can understand. (*Stormy applause.*)

But leading people in the U.S.A. say: We shall try to make a "clean" H-bomb. (*Laughter. Cries: "A clean bomb for dirty work!"*)

What's wrong with that, they ask. We are trying not to pollute or contaminate the air with explosions.

But the fellow who gets caught under a "clean" H-bomb—what difference does it make to him, he dies just the same whether the bomb is "clean" or "dirty"! (*Laughter.*) When they try to persuade people: now don't worry, you'll die from a "clean" bomb, I take that as mockery of human beings, of their noble aspirations for a life of peace.

Ah, some will say, Khrushchov is still not satisfied, he is egging on and inciting against us. Yes, we shall egg on and incite. We shall not relax in the fight for peace until such time as the representatives of the Western powers pay heed to the voice of the peoples and agree to disarmament, to the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and to the banning of their testing. That is what the people of the world, and of the United States, too, want. (*Applause.*)

Only the industrial magnates in the U.S.A. and in some other capitalist countries, amassing huge profits from

arms making, scream for continuing the cold war. In their factories, for example, they make steel, turn this steel into tanks, guns and airplanes and, in this way, pile up huge profits. Millions suffer from this, while the handful of rich wax richer.

We, however, shall persist in the fight for peace.

Why are we on common ground with you in all aspects of the relations between our countries? We have no differences, why? Because you have no capitalists and it is a long time since we have had them. (*Laughter.*) Some people in the U.S.A. say they want to free you, and us, from communist "bondage." (*Laughter.*)

Messieurs the capitalists would do much better to think in terms of saving their own souls before talking about saving others. They had better save themselves. We can get along ourselves. We can stand up for ourselves (*Stormy applause. Cries: "Long live the Soviet Union!"*)

How long is it that we have been getting along without the capitalists? You for more than 10 years and we for nearly 40. Many of us took part in the Revolution when we were still young men. Some of us have gone white, some completely bald. Recall what we were when we took power away from the tsar, capitalists and landlords, and what we are today. The Soviet Union has become a mighty industrial power. You, too, have made big strides. We are well aware that the imperialists cannot reconcile themselves to the existence of countries where the working class, working peasantry and intelligentsia dispose of the country's wealth and are successfully advancing socialist economy.

But whither do you want to drag us? What "liberation" are you prattling about? They would like to seat the capitalists and landlords on the necks of our peoples. What freedom can they offer? Freedom to die.

The capitalists are shrewd. They know how to humbug the working people. We, they say, have full freedom, we are free to vote and root for our candidates. And

in reality? In the U.S.A., for instance, there are two major parties, Republicans and Democrats. They replace each other in office but they uphold the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The power of attraction of our ideas is that the socialist system ensures genuine democracy, genuine freedom for people of labour. What is their democracy? All the wealth is concentrated in their hands, in the hands of the bourgeoisie, of the capitalists. They own the newspapers, the radio, and all other instruments of propaganda. The capitalists have eaten themselves into the body of the people like a tick—you tear it out, but the head remains in the body. The ideologists of capitalism say that everybody there can become a businessman, a capitalist. But just try it. This requires a lot of money.

When the working man is thrown out into the street he may or may not find another job. He may live or he can die of hunger, that is his affair. That is the essence of complete capitalist freedom. (*Laughter.*) No, comrades, we don't want that kind of freedom, we are for the freedom of labour, for the freedom of people, for freedom only for those who work, who create material values for society. This man, the creator of values, should be the real master of his destiny. The reins of government should be in his hands, he should administer state and dispose of the country's wealth.

Which system can provide this? Only the socialist system. Which party stands for this? Only the Marxist-Leninist party. That is why the people, the working class, rally under the banner of the Communist and Workers' parties which adhere to the Marxist-Leninist teaching.

Comrades, we now have in the world both capitalist and socialist states. They must live on one globe, live without war. That is what we mean by peaceful coexistence. We firmly adhere to the Leninist idea of peaceful coexistence. This is said in the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We

are steadfastly realizing these decisions. Some of our people wanted to revise this standpoint, to change the policy of the Communist Party. But our Party did not hesitate to demote those who interfered with carrying out the tasks set by the 20th Party Congress.

Politics does not tolerate liberalism—politics must be logical and consistent. We firmly adhere to the Leninist positions and will resolutely combat those who seek to deflect us from the only true, Leninist path.

We are for peaceful coexistence. We can manage without bombs and are convinced that our cause will be victorious. We shall be victorious! When and in which country communism will be established first, I cannot say. I am not a prophet and have no time for prophecies. Let us, therefore, be patient, the peoples of the non-socialist countries will be convinced by our example that socialism provides a better life. When they become convinced of the superiority of socialism, the peoples will find the strength within themselves, will organize themselves and change the social system. It has never been and never will be our intention to impose this new system upon anyone by force—changing the social system is a domestic matter for the peoples themselves.

Comrades, we must cement the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, strengthen the friendship among the peoples in every socialist country. We have talked in your factories with the workers and engineers and have seen how well the Czechs, Slovaks and others are working together. The matter of consolidating the friendship of the peoples in the socialist countries with different nationalities is very important. In your country Czechs and Slovaks make up the bulk of the population. There are, of course, a number of other nationalities. But just think how many peoples and nationalities we have in the Soviet Union! Hence, the correct implementation of the Leninist national policy is of tremendous importance in the life of our countries. I think you are tackling these matters correctly.

You are working under the leadership of the Communist Party which stands at the head of the National Front. We see that you have confidence in your Party. The strength of the Party lies in its contact with the masses, with the people. It is necessary to keep in touch with the people, to be aware of their needs. This is paramount. We must work so that there should be no repetition of what took place in Hungary, where the Party leadership had lost touch with the people. Although the Hungarian Working People's Party had a membership of 900,000, a mere handful of counter-revolutionary scoundrels seized on its mistakes and, with foreign help, engineered a putsch. If the leadership had not lost touch with the masses, had the Party been strong, nothing of the kind would have taken place. The enemy, naturally, exploited this circumstance. But we cannot blame him, after all, he is the enemy. The blame lies with the leaders who made these mistakes and who enabled the enemy to exploit them against the system of people's democracy. We must draw the appropriate lessons from the Hungarian events, boldly eliminate the mistakes and shortcomings in our work, strengthen contact with the masses, and consolidate the unity of the socialist countries.

There are no contradictions between our countries. We must cooperate still more closely and help each other in order to step up the pace of our development and ensure a further rise in labour productivity. If we employ our wealth and technical facilities better, if we produce more material values to satisfy the requirements of the workers, peasants and intellectuals, of all the working people, our countries will advance still more rapidly along the road of building socialism. The prime task here is to boost labour productivity.

We must do all we can to improve our production and achieve a higher labour productivity than the capitalist countries so as to create better conditions for building so-

cialist society, and ensure higher living standards than the capitalist countries. That is our task.

Allow me once more to thank you for your splendid hospitality, for the warm expression of friendship.

Upon returning to the Soviet Union we shall tell our workers, our collective farmers and all of our working people of your love and respect for them, for the socialist system. These exceptionally warm relations and ardent friendship between our peoples knit us still more firmly together and cement the unbreakable friendship between the Czechoslovak Republic and the Soviet Union, the friendship of all countries of the socialist camp.

I have already spoken about this, but I would like to repeat that I simply can't imagine friendlier relations than those that exist between the peoples of our countries. (*Stormy applause.*)

I wish you every success, dear friends! (*Stormy, prolonged ovation* Cries: "Long live friendship!" "Long live peace!" "Long live the Soviet Union!")

**SPEECH
AT A MEETING OF THE WORKING
PEOPLE OF PRAGUE
DURING VISIT OF SOVIET PARTY
AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION
TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

July 16, 1957

Dear comrades, friends, brothers! (*Stormy, prolonged applause growing into an ovation.*)

Dear citizens of the ancient but ever young city of Prague!

On behalf of the Party and Government Delegation of the Soviet Union, and on the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., I bring you and all the peoples of Czechoslovakia warm fraternal greetings from the peoples of the Soviet Union. (*Stormy ovation Cries in Czech and Russian: "Long live the Soviet Union!"*)

Dear friends, it is difficult to express in words the emotion filling the hearts of all of us, members of the delegation, as we stand here now facing the tens of thousands of our dear friends in a city which is near and dear to every Soviet citizen.

We have spent but a few days in your beautiful capital, golden Prague. But the memory of these unforgettable days will remain forever, and the striking and profound impression made by this city, every street and corner of which is associated with the glorious traditions of the revolutionary and liberation movements, with the selfless and

inspired labour of the peoples of Czechoslovakia, will never fade. (*Applause.*)

Here, from this pedestal, Jan Hus, great fighter and thinker, urges the people tirelessly to uphold the ideals of truth and justice for which he died at the stake (*Applause*)

From Mount Vitkov, Jan Žižka, your national hero, calls upon you to treasure the freedom and independence of your country. The heroic life of this great son of your people is a model teaching us love of country and how to wage battle against all who dare encroach on the people's freedom (*Applause.*)

This ancient Starý Město town hall, destroyed by the Hitler barbarians, where we are now standing, reminds us of the glorious uprising of the working people against the German fascist invaders, of the blood shed on barricades in May 1945 by the heroes of Prague who fought for freedom and a socialist republic

Here, on this square, in February 1948, Klement Gottwald, valiant son of Czechoslovakia and our unforgettable friend and brother, addressed the working people of the country with words filled with revolutionary fervour, urging them to rebuff the plotters then conspiring to return the working people to capitalist bondage. (*Applause*)

In the streets of Prague, the working class and the glorious workers' militia rose to defend their revolutionary gains and did so with honour.

To the Soviet people Prague is dear also because Lenin, our great leader and teacher, lived here 45 years ago, whence he directed the revolutionary movement (*Applause.*) Nor shall we ever forget that, in 1912, the Prague Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party was held here with the fraternal aid of Czech comrades. That conference played an outstanding part in the history of our Party, in the history of the international working-class movement.

Your capital is dear, very dear indeed, both to the Soviet people and to the working men and women of the world. Glory and honour to golden Prague, glory and honour to you, our Prague friends! (*Stormy applause.*)

Dear comrades!

Allow me to extend to you and to all the working people of Czechoslovakia our sincere thanks for the warm and cordial welcome accorded the Party and Government Delegation of the Soviet Union in every town where we had numerous meetings with the people—working men and women, peasants and intellectuals In factories and mills in Czechia, Moravia and Slovakia, in Bratislava, Ostrava, Kosice and Zilina, in Brno and Olomouc, in Plzen and Most, everywhere we were conscious of exceptional warmth for our people and country, we heard words of friendship and the desire to make our friendship stronger still and to fight for world peace. (*Applause, cries: "Long live peace!"*)

The peoples of Czechoslovakia opened up their soul, their big and kind heart to us. We were aware, of course, of the feelings of friendship and respect entertained by the working people of Czechoslovakia for the Soviet Union. And we had anticipated that the Soviet Party and Government Delegation would get a warm and cordial welcome But that which we have experienced has exceeded all our expectations.

We have heard many kind words from the citizens of Czechoslovakia about the Soviet Union, about the fraternal friendship between our peoples. Most popular were the words: "With the Soviet Union forever!" (*Stormy applause growing into an ovation.*)

These words were inscribed on myriads of streamers and on walls; like a powerful call they reverberated on squares and streets We fully agree with these words and tell you from the bottom of our hearts that the peoples of the Soviet Union treasure this friendship just as you do. Our peoples are now together forever! (*Applause*)

May the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia live and prosper down the ages! (*Cries: "Hurrah!" Applause.*)

But we must not only say this. The main thing for us is to justify it by what we do; we must do everything to ensure that the friendship between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia shall be as strong as the steel made in the mills of Ostrava or the Urals! (*Stormy applause*)

The friendship of the peoples of the socialist camp is a great gain. So long as this friendship grows and develops our countries will fear no hardships, and no obstacles will endanger them. We understand this very well. But our opponents, too, are well aware of it, which explains why they resort to every subterfuge to subvert the friendship of the socialist peoples. It is not fortuitous that the American imperialists appropriate over one hundred million dollars annually for subversion against the countries of the socialist camp.

The imperialists tried to overthrow the people's democratic system in Hungary but met with a crushing rebuff. And though the working class, the working people of the Hungarian People's Republic, having smashed the counter-revolutionary plotters, have long since returned to normal life, the imperialists are still on the warpath. They are frantic at their designs having been frustrated, because socialist Hungary, under its People's Government, headed by Comrade Kadar, is now advancing still more confidently along the road of building socialism. (*Stormy applause.*)

The imperialists are animated with deep love for the peoples of the socialist countries, with the desire to "liberate" them from communist "slavery." From what do they want to "liberate" us, comrades?

They want to liberate the workers from the factories and mills in order to take them from the people and hand them over to the capitalists.

They want to liberate the peasants from the land and return it to the landlords and the agrarian magnates. They want to liberate the people from the right freely to elect their people's government, to compel the people again to vote for those who obediently fulfil the will of the capitalists.

What a wonderful "liberty" this would be!

Whom do you take the peoples of the socialist countries for, Messrs imperialists, when you proclaim this "liberty"? Do you really think that your mendacious explanations covering up the essence of this "liberty" can fool the people?

No one will ever succeed in taking away from the peoples of the socialist countries their great gains. (*Stormy applause.*) May the countries of the mighty socialist camp live and prosper forever! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cries: "Long live the Soviet Union!"*)

Dear comrades!

This is our last day in your hospitable country. After a comprehensive exchange of views a joint communiqué has just been signed on the talks and friendly meetings that took place between our delegation and the representatives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Complete identity of views was established on all the questions discussed, identity of understanding on the domestic and foreign policies of the two countries. (*Applause.*)

This is most gratifying and we are glad to record it in the joint communiqué. Such unanimity inspires us in our further activity in the direction charted by the latest congresses of our Parties.

We also discussed the economic relations between our countries. This is a very important question. We have already established fairly good economic relations but they need further expansion in order to attain still better coordination in the work of our industry and agriculture, to

bring our economies closer, with the object of making better and fuller use of our technical and economic potentialities and, through coordination, more efficient utilization of factory floor space and the equipment of Soviet and Czechoslovak factories and mills. Coordination is also imperative in order to bring about a further rise in labour productivity through specialization and automation. This will make it possible to further expand the economy of our countries and, in competition with the capitalist world, to secure greater output for labour expended, which will enable us to secure living standards of which the capitalist states cannot even dream.

Socialist economic management, the friendly bonds linking the socialist countries and coordination in solving economic problems enable us to do this, and we, as representatives of our peoples, as representatives of the Communist Parties, must make full use of the possibilities
(*Applause*)

There also is complete identity of views on all political questions. We stand firm by the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and our position finds full approval and support on the part of the fraternal Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Both we and our Czechoslovak friends are doing everything to strengthen and deepen fraternal relations between all Communist and Workers' parties which adhere to the Marxist-Leninist standpoint. Both we and our Czechoslovak friends stand for wider contacts with the progressive parties in the capitalist countries. We are also for closer contact with Yugoslavia on Marxist-Leninist principles, both at Government and Party level.

Complete identity of views both between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and between our Governments in the sphere of international policy was reaffirmed. We shall continue to pursue as steadfastly as ever the policy of peace, the policy of improving international friendship, irrespective of

the social systems of the states. We shall pursue a policy of peace, for immediate banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons. (*Applause. Repeated cries: "Long live peace!"*)

We are ready right now to sign an agreement to ban atomic and hydrogen bombs. We shall strive for reduction of armaments, regarding it as the first step towards universal disarmament. We shall press for this in order to relieve mankind of the burden of war, of the material and moral burden, in order to create really human conditions for man.

We want all people to live without fear, so that mothers and fathers should be able to bring up their children in tranquillity, so that the vast means now expended on armaments and on the upkeep of armies be used for the benefit of the people, for raising living standards, expanding the economy, building houses and cultural establishments in every country.

This is in the interests not only of the peoples of our countries but of all who live by their labour, who do not live by exploiting others. And these constitute the absolute majority in the world.

Hence we must work ceaselessly and intelligently for this purpose, spare no effort to make all the peoples conscious of the need to fight resolutely for peace, disarmament and coexistence. When the people of all countries become conscious of this, then the imperialist forces which want to continue to grow rich on the cold war, on armaments, to make vast profits from these undertakings, will be curbed and the necessary solution, so vital to humanity, found. (*Applause.*)

Dear comrades!

We are very glad that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is a militant, closely knit vanguard of the working people of your country. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cries: "Long live the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia!"*)

The wisdom of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia also finds expression in the fact that, firmly adhering to Leninist principles, it skilfully unites the working class,

the peasantry and the working intelligentsia of the country, welding all sections of the population of Czechoslovakia into a mighty force

The unity of the working people of Czechoslovakia is embodied in the National Front which includes other parties that stand for building socialism and see the Communist Party as the leading and organizing force of socialist construction

The consolidation of the political parties and mass organizations in the National Front and their friendly joint work for the benefit of the people are a great achievement of the working people, a big victory for the Communist Party which is the soul of the National Front and, by the unanimous will of the people, heads its activities. (*Applause*)

It has been a pleasure to meet the leaders of the National Front parties, to have had talks with them which have assured us once more that these parties and their leaders stand firmly on the platform of the National Front, the principal aim of which is the establishment of socialist society.

With all our heart we wish you further consolidation of the National Front, stronger unity of the working people of Czechoslovakia in their own interests and in the interests of socialism and peace (*Applause.*)

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has always been most closely linked with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. There have never been and, it goes without saying, there are no clouds or frictions now, to cast a shadow on our fraternal friendship. We have always been of one mind both on the internal policy of each country and on foreign policy, on the mutual relations between the Communist and Workers' parties upholding Marxist-Leninist principles, and on all other questions which have affected or affect the international revolutionary and working-class movement. This is due largely to the strict adherence to principle on the part of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia which bases all its activities on Marxist-Leninist principles and the militant traditions established by

Klement Gottwald. These traditions are maintained now by the Central Committee and the Political Bureau of your Party, and it gave us great pleasure to say so to the Central Committee of your Party, to the members of the Political Bureau and to First Secretary Comrade Novotny. (*Applause.*)

Dear comrades, we wish you further successes in the great cause of socialist construction. We take pride in your achievements and regard them as our common achievements because all Communist and Workers' parties have but one goal, the reconstruction of society, the building of communist society

In conclusion, allow me once more to express our sincere gratitude to you and to wish the peoples of Czechoslovakia all the best. Departing from you, we are carrying away with us the deepest love and respect for the peoples of Czechoslovakia. (*Prolonged applause. Cries: "Hurrah!"*)

Upon returning home we shall convey to the Soviet people the love and friendship which we encountered everywhere during our stay in your towns and villages, factories, mills and agricultural cooperatives.

We assure you that we shall do all in our power to strengthen still more our close fraternal relations. We see the way to further consolidation of the fraternal bonds between our peoples above all in unity of action between the Communist Parties of our countries, in their steadfast cooperation. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Long live inviolable friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union! (*Stormy ovation. Cries: "Hurrah!"*)

Long live the great unity of the countries of the socialist camp! (*Stormy ovation. Cries: "Hurrah!"*)

Long live the friendship of the peoples of all countries! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy ovation. Cries: "Hurrah!"*
"Long live peace!" "The Soviet Union is the bulwark of peace!")

SPEECH
AT A SOVIET-CZECHOSLOVAK
FRIENDSHIP MEETING
OF THE WORKING PEOPLE
OF MOSCOW

July 16, 1957

Dear Comrade Muscovites,

We paid with great joy a friendly visit to the fraternal peoples of Czechoslovakia.

To begin with, we have to comply with the ardent wish expressed by the working people of Czechoslovakia at numerous moving meetings, in their letters and telegrams. They asked us to convey to the workers, collective farmers and intelligentsia, to all the Soviet people their warmest fraternal greetings. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

It is a great pleasure, comrades, to report about such a trip as the one we made to fraternal Czechoslovakia. By the way, it was not an excursion, not a holiday trip. Now that we are back home we can tell you that we had been given quite a big job in Czechoslovakia. Our Czechoslovak friends, wanting to strengthen Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship, "exploited" us quite a lot. But we did not mind such "exploitation." (*Animation in the hall. Applause.*) On the contrary, we are highly gratified, because this trip was very useful for the further strengthening of fraternal friendship between our peoples and our Communist Parties.

All of us who took part in this visit are deeply impressed by the exceptional warmth and cordiality which we felt from the first to the last minute of our stay among Czechoslovak friends.

The strongest impression we carried away from our meetings with the working folk of Czechoslovakia is the general and unanimous expression of the sentiments of genuinely fraternal friendship and love for the Soviet people which we saw literally at every step, throughout our tour of cities and villages, on coming in contact with the population at meetings and rallies and in conversations with individual citizens. Words are inadequate to picture the atmosphere of mutual hearty elation, sincere joy and confidence which prevailed at all the meetings of our delegation with the working people of Czechoslovakia. (*Prolonged applause*)

We saw faces lit up with friendly smiles and eyes shining with trust and kindness. It is necessary to feel the warmth of the embraces and handshakes, to hear the sincere cordiality in the voices of the people we met and spoke with, to feel the unaffected friendliness in order to understand and appreciate the full power of the friendly, genuinely brotherly feelings entertained by the peoples of Czechoslovakia for the Soviet people. (*Stormy applause.*)

During this trip we realized still more that the slogan "With the Soviet Union for All Times!" put forward in the past by the great son of the Czechoslovak people Klement Gottwald, originated in the very midst of the people, that it expresses the thoughts and sentiments of all the Czechoslovak people, that this call comes from the great and noble heart of the people. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The Soviet people entertain similar sentiments of profound respect and love for the Czechoslovak people. We Soviet men and women have told, and are telling, our friends and brothers, the Czechs and Slovaks: "The peoples of the Soviet Union are friends of Czechoslovakia forever, for all times!" (*Stormy, prolonged applause*)

What is the reason why the working people of Czechoslovakia met us so warmly, so cordially? The reason is that

we represented the peoples of the country of victorious socialism, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

What is the force which draws the hearts of the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the working folk of the other countries of the world to the Soviet Union? What has won for our people the sympathies of the Czechoslovak people, their warm love and deep respect? Above all the fact that our people, under the leadership of the party headed by V. I. Lenin, were the first to blaze a trail to a new world; the world of socialism. The working class, the working people of our country, our Party earned the gratitude and respect of the working folk of the world for making the October Revolution which initiated the liberation of mankind from the shackles of capitalism and paved the way to a classless society. This way is now confidently followed by the fraternal peoples of Czechoslovakia. And this especially makes for the kinship of our peoples. (*Stormy applause.*)

Enmity has never arisen between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, they have always lived in peace and friendship. During the Second World War, which was a grave trial for the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, friendship between them grew stronger and was tempered in the crucible of joint struggle against the common enemy.

In the course of meetings and conversations, in speeches at rallies, Czechoslovak friends many times stressed the great gratitude of the Czechoslovak peoples to the peoples of the Soviet Union for their exploits in the war against Hitler Germany, for assistance in liberating Czechoslovakia, for invaluable aid in saving Prague which the fascists doomed to destruction. Soviet soldiers and soldiers of the Czechoslovak Corps, Soviet and Czechoslovak guerrillas inscribed golden pages in the annals of the friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. (*Applause.*)

A new stage in the development of friendly, genuinely fraternal relations set in after the war. The working folk of Czechoslovakia established in their country a people's democratic system and took the path of socialism. On this path they gained in the Soviet people their most loyal, most reliable and unselfish friend. Now we are still more united by community of interests, unity of ideology, and ultimate goal. Relations found only in a very harmonious family have developed between us (*Applause.*)

Not so much time has passed since the people's democratic system triumphed in Czechoslovakia. But, comrades, look what big progress the working people of the Czechoslovak Republic have made following the road of building socialism. It is a fact that Czechoslovakia was a highly developed industrial country in the past as well. But it has far advanced after the war. We can note with great satisfaction that the working folk of Czechoslovakia have scored outstanding achievements in developing their economy and culture during the years of people's rule. Suffice it to say that during this period industrial output has increased by 150 per cent. Czechoslovak plants are manufacturing such powerful, intricate and high-precision machinery, equipment and instruments as may be envied by a country most advanced technically. Great successes have been registered in cultural progress and in raising the living standards of the people. All this is a result of selfless labour by the glorious working class and all the working folk of Czechoslovakia. (*Applause.*)

As you know from press reports, our delegation visited a number of industrial and cultural centres in Czechoslovakia. We met and spoke with very many people. Among them were workers, specialists, peasants, office employees, scientists, writers and artists, Party and Government officials. Our meetings were very cordial and the talks were frank and exceptionally friendly.

From all these meetings and talks we formed the opinion that the Czechoslovak people are closely rallied

round the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Government of the National Front, are devoted to the cause of socialism. (*Stormy applause.*)

We were pleased to see that much had been accomplished in Czechoslovakia in solving the national problem in the spirit of the Leninist principles. All kinds of national restrictions which existed in bourgeois Czechoslovakia have been eliminated, the national minorities have been given equal rights with the leading nationalities and provided with the material conditions for exercising these rights. An end has been put forever to mutual distrust, antagonism and national isolation. All this has united the national groups in the country in the effort to develop further the economy and culture, advance the living standards of the people, to build communism.

It goes without saying that account must be taken of the fact that remnants of former exploiting classes still exist in Czechoslovakia and that they are not simply living the rest of their days passively, but are trying to offer resistance to the people's democratic system. This resistance is most frequently of a concealed nature and is manifested chiefly in influencing ideologically the politically less stable section of the population, in spreading all kinds of inimical rumours and "theories" of bourgeois propaganda, in agitating against various measures of the Party and the Government.

But, of course, it is not these remnants of the defeated classes that make the political climate in the country. The remarkable working class of Czechoslovakia, the majority of the working peasantry, and the intelligentsia devoted to the people have inscribed on their banner a sacred word, socialism, and, closely rallied round the Communist Party and their People's Government, are confidently and firmly following the socialist path. (*Prolonged applause.*)

This feeling of the monolithic unity of the Czechoslovak people, their loyalty to socialism was with us all the time while we stayed in the country. Wherever we came,

we witnessed the great labour uplift of the people, their desire to do their utmost and their best in strengthening their country. This means that the Czechoslovak people have firmly taken the road of building socialism and are enthusiastically and single-heartedly laying a solid foundation of a new society. Does not this, comrades, testify to the triumph of the Marxist-Leninist teaching? Is not this a reliable guarantee that all mankind will, sooner or later, take to the path now followed by 900 million people? (*Stormy applause.*)

And there is one more thing that particularly impressed us—the high prestige of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the respect it enjoys among the people. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has won this respect by always being a party of revolutionary action, a militant Marxist-Leninist party. This Party from its very inception taught the Czechoslovak people to hate all forms of social and national oppression, to fight for freedom and a better future.

The Czechoslovak people know that it is the Communist Party which led them to power, that only thanks to its leadership have they become the undivided master in their country, the owner of all its wealth. The Czechoslovak people know that if they succeeded in upholding their great gains in the trying days of February 1948, credit for this goes first and foremost to the Communist Party. That is why the Czechoslovak people highly respect their Communist Party, meet with full trust all its undertakings and work with great enthusiasm to carry out the programme of building socialism mapped out by the Party. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Communist Party is supporting and rallying all the forces of the country which are united in the National Front and stand for building socialism.

Comrades, during its visit the Soviet Party and Government Delegation had talks with the leaders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Government of the

Czechoslovak Republic. We are happy to report to you that our talks took place in the most cordial and frank atmosphere, in a spirit of fraternal friendship and mutual understanding. (*Applause.*)

There is full unanimity of views now, as before, between us and the Czechoslovak comrades on questions of ideology and the practice of building socialism and communism, on assessing the present international situation and defining the tasks of the home and foreign policies of each of our countries (*Stormy applause*)

We told our Czechoslovak friends about the decisions of the June Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the C P S U The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia expressed full solidarity with these decisions, resolutely condemned the anti-Party actions of Malenkov, Kaganovich, Molotov. Our Czechoslovak comrades, just as the comrades from the other fraternal parties, hold that the exposure of this anti-Party group will further strengthen the unity of the C P S.U., the monolithic solidarity of its Central Committee, and promote the struggle for the successful application of the general line of the Party mapped out by the Twentieth Congress of the C P S.U. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

It was reaffirmed during the talks between the Czechoslovak comrades and ourselves that the Leninist unity of the ranks of the Communist and Workers' parties, the monolithic solidarity of their ranks and unity within their leading organs on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist principles, are the source of their strength and invincibility. We can say with great satisfaction that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is fighting steadfastly for the purity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, has always been, and is, loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism, is coming out boldly and determinedly against all the manifestations of revisionism and is fighting sectarianism and dogmatism. (*Applause.*)

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia can rightly be proud of the big contribution it is making to the consolidation of the unity of the Communist and Workers' parties and the entire international working-class movement.

Dear comrades, friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia is strong and unbreakable. (*Stormy, prolonged applause*) So, let us, comrades, continue to develop this friendship, strengthen friendship between all the socialist countries. If the countries of the socialist camp are united, no trials and storms can daunt us. In unity is our strength, and this strength is colossal. (*Applause*)

Let us work persistently to consolidate friendly relations not only with the socialist countries, but also with all the countries of the world which are for peaceful coexistence. Let us work for peace and the security of the nations. (*Applause.*)

Allow me, on behalf of the Party and Government Delegation and on your behalf, to express full-hearted gratitude to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Political Bureau and the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. Comrade Antonín Novotný, the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic and the Chairman of the Government Viliam Široký, to the leaders of the parties of the National Front, to all the working people of the Czechoslovak Republic, for the warm reception and hospitality accorded to the representatives of the Soviet people. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Let us wish our dear Czechoslovak friends fresh successes in the great work of building socialism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause*)

Long live the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Republic and may it thrive forever! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

**ADDRESS DELIVERED
IN THE PEOPLE'S CHAMBER
OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLIC DURING VISIT
OF SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT
DELEGATION TO G.D.R.**

August 8, 1957

Esteemed Comrade President,
Esteemed Deputies of the People's Chamber,
Dear comrades and friends,

Allow me to thank you from the bottom of my heart for the cordial and friendly welcome accorded to the Soviet Party and Government Delegation. It gives me great pleasure to convey to you, and through you to all the people of the German Democratic Republic, warm, fraternal greetings from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Supreme Soviet, the Government and the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

We highly appreciate the invitation extended to our delegation to address the People's Chamber, the supreme organ of the state power of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and all the working people of your Republic. We regard this as a great honour.

Our delegation has come to the German Democratic Republic at the kind invitation of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and your Government by way of return for the visit paid to the Soviet Union by the Government Delegation of your Republic last January. In our country the stay of your Government Delegation in Moscow is recalled with great pleasure,

We believe that personal contacts between statesmen are of great importance for extending and consolidating friendly relations between countries and serve the cause of world peace.

Friendship and understanding between the Soviet and German peoples are, undoubtedly, of especial importance for the consolidation of peace and security in Europe. Lasting peace and international security can be assured only if our two peoples live in harmony and friendship, only if they pool their efforts to safeguard world peace and steadfastly defend it.

We observe with profound satisfaction that the friendly, fraternal relations between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic are being steadily consolidated. Indeed, it cannot be otherwise. Our relations are based on the grand principles of proletarian internationalism, on our community of ideas and joint struggle for a happy future for our peoples, on mutual support and aid.

The peoples of the Soviet Union sincerely wish to live in friendship with all the German people. We are striving for good relations and economic and cultural contacts with the other German state, the Federal Republic. We do not see any unsurmountable obstacles in the way of such relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic. They would but benefit the two countries and accord with the interests of strengthening peace in Europe. So far, however, we have not met with the necessary understanding and desire on the part of the West German Government to develop such relations.

Dear friends and comrades!

The establishment of the Democratic Republic was an event of historic significance in the life of the German people, a turning point in the history of Europe. For the first time in the history of Germany, a peace-loving and democratic state has appeared on her territory, a state whose home and foreign policy is shaped to meet the interests of the broad masses of the people.

Whereas all previous German states were vehicles for the aggressive policy of the Prussian Junkers, bankers and imperialist monopoly tycoons, the Democratic Republic consistently implements the principles of peace and international friendship. In this part of Germany an end has been put to the domination of imperialist reaction and its criminal policy of wars of aggrandizement which have brought so much suffering to the German people.

All honest persons see now that the Democratic Republic is the bulwark of all peace-loving forces in Germany. The German people are indebted precisely to the Democratic Republic for the fact that they are regaining the trust and respect of the European nations who experienced the horrors of Nazi occupation and lost millions of their sons and daughters in the deadly grapple with Nazi Germany.

The working class has become the leading force in your country. Under its leadership and the leadership of its militant vanguard, the Socialist Unity Party, the Democratic Republic is successfully advancing along the road charted more than one hundred years ago by Marx and Engels, the great sons of the German people and founders of scientific socialism (*Prolonged applause.*)

Your successes are obvious to all. Suffice it to recall that industrial output in the Democratic Republic has increased more than one hundred per cent as against 1936.

We know that it was not easy to achieve these splendid results, that you had to overcome many serious difficulties and obstacles. These difficulties still exist to a certain extent, being due in no small measure to the division of Germany and the severance of economic contacts which developed over centuries.

The ruling quarters of West Germany tried to speculate on these difficulties. Having severed economic contacts with you, they banked on foiling or retarding the economic development of the Republic. But they miscalculated. In a country where the people are the owners of the national resources and are building a new, socialist society, oppor-

tunities unknown in the capitalist world are provided for the development of the productive forces, and boundless popular energy and initiative are released.

The working people of the G.D.R. mobilized their internal resources, surmounted the difficulties, established new branches of industry and laid solid foundations for further development. Whereas uneasiness and alarm are increasing in West Germany in connection with the downward trend in the economy, and fear of the future is growing, the working people of your Republic look confidently to the future.

The national economy of the Democratic Republic has good prospects because it is developed according to plan and is not threatened by crises and depressions inevitable under the capitalist system. Moreover, yours is not an isolated economy. Your Republic belongs to the community of socialist states which are its unselfish friends. The Soviet Union and the other socialist states guarantee the Democratic Republic a stable and advantageous market for its goods. This ensures full capacity operation of your industry and full employment for your population. (*Applause.*)

The many meetings and talks between the representatives of governments, as well as of the Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist states that have been held of late have shown that all the socialist states, the Communist and Workers' parties, believe it to be their sacred duty to defend and consolidate their unity which is our common great accomplishment.

It is gratifying to know that the meeting held a few days ago between the Delegation of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee and the Soviet Government and the Delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist League of Yugoslavia and the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia was another step towards consolidating the unity of the socialist states. (*Applause.*)

We have encountered and shall yet encounter many difficulties and obstacles on our way. The enemies of

socialism are doing their utmost to hamper us. But we need fear no difficulties and no enemy intrigues if we all firmly guard our unity, if we promote and consolidate fraternal cooperation between us, basing it on the immortal principles of Marxism-Leninism (*Stormy applause.*)

The working people of our states are sure that socialism will triumph in peaceful competition with capitalism. The socialist countries have long outstripped the most advanced capitalist states as regards the rate of industrial development. They have all the necessary conditions to overtake and outstrip economically the most advanced capitalist states as regards per capita production. This will be done much quicker if economic cooperation between the socialist states will be consolidated and perfected on the basis of a rational division of labour, cooperation of production and coordination of their national economic programmes. (*"Hear! Hear!"*)

Your Republic, which is now building socialism, is in direct proximity to highly developed capitalist states. This imposes a particularly great responsibility on the working class and all your people. Your success in developing the productive forces and raising the material and cultural standards of the population will be graphic proof for the workers and peasants of the capitalist West of the advantages of the socialist system.

The experience of the establishment and consolidation of the German Democratic Republic convincingly shows again what a great force the working class is when rallied around its Marxist-Leninist party. In the Socialist Unity Party the working class of your Republic has a tried and tested militant leader which has no other aims or purposes but concern for the good of the working people. By its struggle for the Democratic Republic the Socialist Unity Party has shown that, as the militant vanguard of the working class, it is the champion of the national aspirations of all the German people and that it loyally serves their interests. (*Prolonged applause.*) ..

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the great leader of the working people, taught that the decisive condition for strengthening the working people's power and building socialism is the unshakeable unity of the ranks of the working-class party, irreconcilable struggle against all manifestations of factionalism and revisionism. We observe with great joy that the Socialist Unity Party and its Central Committee abide by this behest of Lenin's and steadfastly safeguard organizational and ideological unity on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles, resolutely rebuff all attempts at revising Lenin's teaching. Permit me on behalf of our Party and Government Delegation to greet the Socialist Unity Party and its Central Committee! (*Stormy applause*)

It is the great merit of the working class of the G.D.R. and its Socialist Unity Party that they succeeded in rallying all the democratic forces and political parties to the struggle for the consolidation of the workers' and peasants' power and the new social system and in uniting them in the National Front.

Of course, the parties collaborating in the democratic bloc and the National Front differ in views and opinions. Indeed, if there were no differences, there would be no reason for the existence of several parties. But differences are not the main and determining factor in relations between the democratic bloc parties. The main thing is their unity in the struggle for their common lofty aims which conform to the interests of the German people. (*Applause.*)

Allow me, on behalf of our delegation, to hail the National Front and the parties cooperating with the Socialist Unity Party and wish them further success in their common struggle for the happiness of the people of Germany. (*Stormy applause.*)

Dear friends and comrades, we realize that you, the working people of the Democratic Republic, as well as the working people of West Germany, are deeply anxious about the national reunification of your homeland. We share your

feelings and regard them as being perfectly natural and legitimate

For the past several years the question of reuniting Germany has been the pivot of acute political struggle and acrid debates, since not only the future of the German people, but also, in no small measure, the future of Europe, peace and international security, hinge on how this question is solved, and on what basis

The crux of the matter is. What kind of united Germany should emerge as a result of reunification and how will it develop?

The working class and all working people of Germany, all who prize the national interests of the German people, and peace and security in Europe, justly believe that the united Germany should be a peace-loving, democratic state.

The heads of the imperialist monopolies, the militarists and the revanchists who have never displayed any sympathy with the interests of the German working people and who have brought them so much suffering, do not want Germany to take to this road. They dream of subjecting all Germany to the domination of the imperialist monopolies, of shunting it back to the old road of war and aggression which on two occasions brought the German people to national disaster.

The imperialist forces of the West act as inspirers of the German militarists. Reunification along peaceful democratic lines runs counter to their plans. They want a united Germany that would be a docile tool for the implementation of their aggressive schemes. In their delirious designs for world domination they again assign to the German people the role of cannon fodder, and reckon on waging war with their hands.

Such are the two lines, the policies for reuniting Germany and deciding her future.

The question is often posed: Which of these lines conforms to the historical traditions of the German people? We know that the history of Germany knows two basic trends and two traditions which have always conflicted and still conflict with one another. The first is the tradition of great German humanists and democrats, who advocated the democratic unity of their homeland, the humane ideas of peace and international friendship. The finest traditions of the German liberation movement were taken over by the working class, which, striving for social emancipation, always fought and is now fighting for a peace-loving Germany. The continuers of the finest traditions are by right all who fight the revival of militarism, for a single, peace-loving and democratic Germany. These progressive traditions are embodied in the policy of the German Democratic Republic.

But the history of Germany knows other traditions too, traditions deeply inimical to the interests of the German people. These are the traditions of the Prussian Junkers, and of the tycoons of the imperialist monopolies and banks, who repeatedly sacrificed the interests of the nation on the altar of their own selfish class interests. These reactionary traditions find expression today in the policy of the ruling circles of West Germany. The national interests of Germany, the interests of peace and international security urgently demand the rooting up of these anti-popular traditions.

The Soviet people, who have experienced the aggressive character of German militarism and fascism, side with the progressive forces of the German people who are fighting the anti-national policy of German finance capital, the revival of imperialism and militarism, and the revanchist forces in West Germany. (*Stormy applause.*)

The policy of militarization and preparation of atomic war now pursued by the ruling quarters of the Federal Republic and their Western partners, places the European peoples, and above all the German people, in a precarious position.

In our age of unparalleled development of military techniques and mass-annihilation weapons, a new war may turn prosperous and densely populated areas into a desert. This should be especially borne in mind by those West German leaders who want a new war. In the event of the imperialists unleashing war, atomic and hydrogen bombs, terrible means of destruction, will explode right here, on the line dividing the NATO bloc countries and the forces of the socialist camp.

It is extremely important for the West Germans to realize this at last and forestall this turn of events. The German people must avert this catastrophe, and they will be able to do so, provided they do not let a handful of militarists and monopolists decide their fate.

Thought should also be given to this by the statesmen of Britain, France and other countries whose territories, in the event of hostilities, will be within the range of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The statesmen of the United States, too, should ponder this, because nowadays, when rocket techniques are being rapidly developed, distance no longer guarantees any country against atomic and hydrogen weapon attacks.

Certainly all those gentlemen who refuse to pursue a policy of peace and to achieve agreement on disarmament should give thought to the matter.

The German people bear a huge responsibility for peace in Europe, for the future of their country. The peace-loving forces of Europe and the world hope that they will answer with a resolute "no!" to the policy of reviving German militarism. These forces believe that the German people will be strong enough to curb the militarists who are preparing another national catastrophe for Germany.

And the force that can do this is, above all, the German working class, at the cradle of whose revolutionary struggle stood Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. This working class fought the anti-popular policy of the Prussian Junkers and imperialists under such outstanding leaders of the German

and international working-class movement as August Bebel, Wilhelm and Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring and Ernst Thaelmann.

Now more than ever before it is necessary to unite all the forces of the working class of the two Germanies. Anyone who holds dear the national interests of Germany, the peace and security of the peoples cannot but be concerned over the policy of West Germany. Only the conversion of all Germany into a peace-loving democratic state will ensure independent existence and development for the German people. (*Prolonged applause*) The path of war is the way to national catastrophe.

At this juncture I would like to say a few words about the West German industrialists. They are now getting huge profits from the arms drive. But they would do well to remember that, firstly, a "prosperity" founded on such insecure foundations as militarization is transient; as a rule it is followed by a severe economic crisis. And secondly, that in Nazi times, too, German industrialists grew rich on the manufacture of arms and that many of them ended by rendering account to the German people and the peoples of other countries as war criminals.

Profits can be obtained from export of civilian production for which a good market can always be found, given the desire to improve economic relations with the socialist countries. The way of armaments, however, is a way on which one can lose all. (*Cries: "Quite right!" "One's head too!"*)

We are fully aware that at present the unification of Germany is no easy matter. There is a single German people, but there are two Germanies, differing in political and social systems, and poles apart in home and foreign policies. There is no escaping this fact. Those who really desire the unification of Germany cannot but take account of this. It is obvious that, in these circumstances, any attempt to unite Germany through some formal legal act imposed from without would mean indulging in a dangerous illusion.

Some West German politicians believe that the unification should be settled by the four Great Powers. But on what grounds? It is impossible to ignore the German people and to solve the question of Germany's reunification behind their backs, to enforce a decision from without.

The times when the destinies of nations were decided against their will have long passed. The Germans are masters of their country and they themselves should settle the question of reunification. This does not mean, naturally, that we want to divest the four Powers of responsibility for the fate of Germany. The difference lies in the understanding of this responsibility. In our opinion, the duty of the four Powers is to help the Germans in every way to settle their national problem along peaceful democratic lines, by way of direct negotiations between the two German states (*Applause*). There is no denying that this is a difficult way. Much effort and time will be needed to overcome the obstacles, differences and contradictions between the two Germanies. Still, it is perfectly clear that any progress in this matter should be sought in talks between the Democratic and Federal Republics. This way, difficult though it may be, is the only correct one.

This is precisely the viewpoint of the Government of the Democratic Republic which, taking cognizance of the national interests of all the Germans, has repeatedly announced its readiness to enter into negotiations. And if the Federal Government persists in declining any contact with the Government of the Democratic Republic, it will merely demonstrate once again that it is unwilling to settle the question peacefully and is deliberately deepening the division.

It is particularly valuable for the cause of reunification that the Government of the Democratic Republic does not confine itself to general declarations of readiness to negotiate with West Germany but has suggested a concrete way towards peaceful restoration of unity, a way perfectly realistic even in the present complicated condi-

tions. It has suggested the setting up of a German Confederation, that is to say, a treaty-based union of two sovereign states committed to a common policy on a definite range of foreign and domestic matters. The well-known statement by the Government of the Democratic Republic of July 27 represents a programme of practical measures conforming to the vital national interests of the German people.

We favour and support these proposals and believe that the reunification programme proposed by the Government of the Democratic Republic will meet with understanding and support of the population in the two parts of Germany and find the way to the hearts of millions of Germans (*Prolonged applause*)

By putting forward its programme for the peaceful and democratic reunification of Germany, for a German Confederation, the Democratic Republic has once again demonstrated that it is the bulwark of the peace-loving forces of the German people who are striving for a lasting peace and the prosperity of their country.

The proposals show that the Democratic Republic stands for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, that it seeks a peaceful solution of controversial issues. The rulers of the Federal Republic and its Chancellor, Adenauer, follow a different policy. Herr Adenauer is all for the "positions of strength" policy of which he is the chief exponent.

As we know, Hitler, too, had his "positions of strength" policy. We also know what came of it. It brought untold suffering to the peoples of Europe, including the German people.

Our visit to the Democratic Republic is being used by the press close to the Bonn Government as a pretext for charging the Soviet Union with interference in the election campaign in the Federal Republic (*Laughter*). There is hardly any need to stress the groundlessness of this. The Soviet Union has never interfered in the domestic affairs

of the Federal Republic of Germany and has no intention of doing so.

But we cannot overlook the fact that Herr Adenauer, carried away by the election fever, has elevated vilification of the Soviet Union to the level of state policy. Undisguised hostility to the Soviet Union is increasingly apparent in his speeches, we hear the same old charges and calls that the Soviet people have heard so often, even in pre-war days (*"Hear! Hear!"*)

In a recent interview with an American correspondent Herr Adenauer alleged that Khrushchov and the Soviet armed forces were simply waiting for the opportune moment to attack the United States. (*Laughter.*) And the other day, at an election meeting, he claimed that the Russians were out to conquer the world—he even alleged that we had frankly told him so in Moscow. Fancy, asking Herr Adenauer's advice how to conquer the world! (*General laughter.*)

His lieutenants, such as Brentano or Strauss, are not a whit behind their Chancellor and sometimes outstrip him in fantastic fabrications about our country. What can one say about these puerile slanders? Clearly, it is not fair weather that makes the West German leaders resort to such cheap stunts. Herr Adenauer, presumably, hopes that they will enable him to conserve his declining influence. I think that in the long run he will be the loser. Times have changed, the people are waking up politically, it is becoming more difficult to deceive them (*"Hear! Hear!"*)

The Adenauer way for Germany is a way that is fraught with grave dangers for her people. That is why all the healthy forces of the German people, all who want to prevent war and aggression, to settle controversial issues peacefully, are opposed to his policy.

Herr Adenauer craftily deceives part of the German people, and even goes so far as to say that he champions the interests of the working class. (*Loud laughter.*) But the workers are becoming increasingly aware of the danger of

his policy. We are convinced that the German working class will raise its voice for peace, will have its say in settling the question of peaceful unification and use its opportunities to curb militarism and the unleashing of a new war. (*Stormy applause.*)

The West German rulers are impervious to the fate of the German people. It is worth noting that, having refused to discuss reunification with Germans, they are all for discussing it with the governments of the United States, Britain and France, as if West Germany were being merged with America or Britain and not with East Germany. (*Animation. Laughter.*)

The Adenauer Government spurns talks between the two German states on the plea that this would be tantamount to recognizing the division of Germany. But the existence of the two states is an undeniable fact which must, perforce, be taken into consideration.

Not long ago the governments of the United States, Britain, France, and West Germany issued a declaration "On the Principles of a Common Policy for Reunification of Germany." But this declaration shows that the Western powers still adhere to a position which cannot but result in consolidating the division of Germany and prolonging the arms drive.

They repeat that an all-German government can be formed only through "free elections" throughout Germany. But this is rank hypocrisy. Can there be free elections in the Federal Republic when the Communist Party is banned and progressive organizations of the working people and peace supporters suffer police persecution, while war criminals and Nazis play an increasingly important role in political life? The politicians in Bonn want a mechanical union of the Democratic Republic with the Federal Republic, they want to make it a domain of the Junkers and the Rhine and Ruhr magnates.

The Western powers are opposed to "neutralization or demilitarization of Germany." In their scheme of things

the united Germany should join the aggressive Atlantic bloc while the occupation troops should stay.

Regardless of the phraseology used by the Bonn authorities and their Western partners, it is quite clear that their programme aims to turn all Germany into an aggressive, imperialist state, into NATO's principal military base in Europe. What is more, this programme, highly inimical to the national interests of the German people, bears the signature of the West German Government which claims to represent all Germany. Chancellor Adenauer not only warned against disarmament during his recent talks with President Eisenhower, he even asked him not to reduce the American forces in Europe.

Adenauer's policy is designed to thwart disarmament. He argues fiercely against any settlement in this vitally important matter—a source of worry to all mankind.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly urged the Western powers to begin an agreed gradual withdrawal of troops from Germany. It has declared more than once its readiness to withdraw all its troops not only from the German Democratic Republic, but also from Poland, Hungary and Rumania, provided the United States and the other NATO countries take their troops from West Germany, France, Britain and the other West European countries.

Why don't the Western powers accept our proposal? It is simple, logical and clear. (*"Hear! Hear!"*) Let us restore the conditions normal for peace-time. Let each nation shape its life within its own borders, as it pleases, without the presence of foreign troops. The Soviet Union will agree to this unhesitatingly. But the United States is against it. American troops are to remain in Europe to control not only West Germany, but other West European countries as well. And it is not only in Europe that it has troops.

As can be seen from the statements of the Western powers and the Federal Republic, they are continuing to confuse and complicate the question of reunification, making it an object of political huckstering. One cannot play on

the legitimate strivings of the German people for unification!

Once again recourse is taken to an old manoeuvre, designed to pigeonhole reunification and universal disarmament. A disarmament settlement, we are told, presupposes a preliminary solution of German reunification.

But these are entirely different questions. Reunification of Germany is primarily a matter for the Germans themselves. Disarmament affects the interests of all—the nations of the world are vitally interested in it (*"Hear! Hear!"*)

The Soviet Union has given sufficient proof of its good will in the matter of disarmament. Only recently, taking into consideration the fact that no agreement on disarmament had yet been reached with the Western powers, it suggested a gradual approach, to agree, for the time being, on suspension of nuclear tests for a definite period, say, for two or three years, together with appropriate international control. But even this simple proposal has not met with support on the part of the Western governments.

Despite this attitude, the Soviet Union will not give up its search for ways and means of reaching agreement.

The Soviet Union consistently advocates peaceful coexistence of all countries. In recent times we have improved relations with a number of countries and have, specifically, established diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic. Moreover, steps have been taken to normalize economic relations with West Germany and to establish cultural and technical cooperation.

In taking these steps we have proceeded from the assumption that all-round improvement of relations with West Germany will help in reaching better understanding between the Soviet people and the German people as a whole and contribute to a solution of the reunification problem.

It is our bounden duty to say that the unconcealed hostility of the ruling circles of West Germany in relation to the Soviet Union does nothing to ease international tension. Certain West German officials take the liberty of

threatening the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and chant revanchist slogans. They agitate for wresting from Poland and Czechoslovakia their western territories.

It is time that these West German politicians now obstructing the establishment of good relations between our countries realized that their attitude bodes nothing good to West Germany herself. It was not fortuitous that far-sighted German statesmen always attached great importance to good relations between Germany and Russia.

Chancellor Bismarck, a far-sighted politician of bourgeois Germany, once said:

"It is my belief that, provided no irresponsible parties and individuals gain ascendancy in Germany, there will be no conflicts between Germany and Russia. For us Russia's friendship is most important of all" ("*Hear! Hear!*") Bismarck indignantly rejected the attempts by foreign powers to impose on Germany the role of a hound to be unleashed against Russia.

Another distinguished German personality of a later period, Joseph Wirth, former Chancellor of the Weimar Republic, said. "Until Russia and Germany began to quarrel with one another the two peoples lived well in Europe" ("*Hear! Hear!*")

These, I think, are very wise words and they should be pondered by those who shape the foreign policy of the Federal Republic.

Dear comrades, friends, the hospitality and warmth with which the people of the Democratic Republic have welcomed our delegation speak better than words of the friendly relations between our countries. Our people have feelings of heartfelt friendship for your working people. (*Prolonged applause.*)

This friendship is a great achievement. Resting on the solid and unshakeable foundations of proletarian internationalism, it is inspired by the grand ideas of better fu-

ture for mankind. The Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic are united first of all by the ideals of socialism.

There are no stronger bonds than the bonds of brotherhood founded on truly socialist principles. We have always considered and will consider it our duty to develop and consolidate all-round cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic (*Stormy applause.*)

Our two countries are parties to the Warsaw Treaty, the aim of which is to do away with the grave danger to peace in Europe arising from the aggressive North Atlantic bloc. You may rest assured that, if necessary, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will fulfil their duty to the German Democratic Republic and help it to defend its democratic gains, freedom and independence (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The Soviet Union has always stood for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. Its Government, in its relations with other countries, is guided by the decisions of the historic 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which clearly stipulate adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence of the socialist and capitalist countries.

This year our people will celebrate the fortieth anniversary of their socialist state. And looking back over the path we have traversed, we experience satisfaction and understandable pride with what has been accomplished in these forty years by a people freed from the fetters of capitalism, from the landlord yoke.

In a relatively brief space of time our once backward country has grown into a mighty socialist state, holding second place in the world for industrial output. (*Applause.*) The collective-farm system ensures the steady advancement of socialist agriculture. Considerable progress has been made in raising the material standards of the working people. The culture, science and art of all the peoples of the multi-national Soviet Union are in full bloom.

We have, of course, not a few difficulties. But the burgeoning initiative of the masses and their active participation in running the state help the Communist Party and the Soviet Government to overcome the difficulties and to find new and better forms and methods of organization and work.

On the road to communism we have to overcome not only the resistance of imperialists, but also to combat backward sentiments in our own ranks, conservatism, bureaucracy and loss of feeling for the new on the part of some functionaries. Our Party demotes those who become divorced from life, who refuse to take cognizance of the changes taking place in the country and in the international arena.

The decisions of the June Plenary Meeting of our Party's Central Committee have met with understanding and the support of the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties. Of course, there are bourgeois politicians who indulge in insinuations in connection with these decisions and who predict a change in Soviet policy.

Our policy was defined by the 20th Congress of the Communist Party. We shall exert even more persistent efforts to develop the productive forces, raise the material and cultural standards of the working people, pursue a foreign policy based on the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence between states with differing social systems, uphold peace, friendship and cooperation with all countries, consolidate the socialist camp to the utmost.

Dear comrade deputies, nothing can be nobler than to work for peace and international friendship. Our forces, the forces of socialism and democracy are growing and becoming stronger every day. The Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, all the countries of the socialist camp are fully resolved to uphold peace. The ranks of the active fighters for peace are growing in all countries. The enemies of international cooperation are opposed by the mighty forces of the peace-loving peoples, and we are convinced

that the peace-loving forces will be victorious (*Stormy applause*)

Permit me, esteemed comrades, to wish you, and through you, all the working people of the German Democratic Republic, every success in the struggle for peace, for socialism, for a united Germany (*Stormy applause*)

Allow me to thank you for the opportunity to address the People's Chamber, to thank you for your attention. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Our Party and Government Delegation, which is present at this session of the supreme authority of the Democratic Republic, listened with close attention to the speech made by Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl. With all our hearts, and without the least intention of flattering you, we express our profound satisfaction with this colourful speech setting out the policy of your Government.

We are happy to say that there is not a single point at issue between us. The proposals which Comrade Grotewohl mentioned here will make for still closer unity of our forces in the struggle for socialism. (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the German Democratic Republic! (*Stormy, prolonged applause*)

Long live the powerful camp of socialism and democracy! (*Stormy, prolonged applause*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, prolonged applause growing into ovation*)

**SPEECH
AT A MEETING OF THE WORKING
PEOPLE OF LEIPZIG
DURING VISIT OF SOVIET PARTY
AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION
TO G.D.R.**

August 9, 1957

Dear Comrade Ulbricht,
Dear comrades and friends,

We Russians say that not even water can dampen real friendship. (*Laughter, applause.*) Today we can say that the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the German people is such that even this downpour will not dampen it. (*Laughter, stormy applause.*)

Allow me on behalf of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., the Soviet Government, the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, on behalf of all the Soviet people to convey warm, friendly greetings to the working people of Leipzig (*Stormy applause*)

We tender heartfelt thanks to the residents of Leipzig for their hospitable and cordial welcome which has deeply moved us. Many thanks for the nice friendly things you have said about our country and the Soviet people.

We are delighted at the opportunity of meeting the working people of Leipzig, one of the biggest centres of the labour movement of Germany, a city of revolutionary traditions, and renowned for its culture, technology and science.

The Soviet people are well acquainted with your city also because of its associations with the great Lenin, the founder of our Communist Party and the Soviet state. They are deeply grateful to the working people of Leipzig who cherish

the memory of Vladimir Ilyich. We recall with pleasure that it was in Leipzig that *Iskra*, the all-Russian political newspaper, first appeared, with help from progressive German workers, the newspaper that played such an enormous role in founding a revolutionary Marxist Party in Russia.

Leipzig has many associations with the German and international labour movement, with such outstanding leaders as August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht and Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, Ernst Thaelmann and Klara Zetkin.

It was here in Leipzig that Georgi Dimitrov, the great son of the Bulgarian people and fearless fighter for the working class, raised his passionate voice in upholding the honour of the revolutionary communist movement. Even today the remarkable words which Dimitrov courageously hurled at fascist provocateurs have a prophetic ring. "The wheel of history," he said, "moves on towards the ultimate, inevitable, irrepressible goal of communism." (*Prolonged applause*)

Yes, history is indeed moving on. Only forty years have passed since the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia heralded the advent of a new era in human history. But in this time socialism has come, and come to stay, not only in the Soviet Union but also in a number of other countries of Europe and Asia. The socialist world system has emerged and is growing stronger.

Time has made cruel mockery of the claims of the apologists of capitalism that socialism suits only economically backward countries. The successful socialist construction in your Republic and in countries such as Czechoslovakia, for instance, convincingly demonstrates the groundlessness of these assertions. It is precisely the highly developed countries that can traverse the road to communism more quickly and successfully.

The experience of the Soviet Union and of the countries in Europe and Asia which have taken the socialist road is the best and most convincing proof of the undoubted supe-

riority of socialism to capitalism. And our firm conviction is that, sooner or later, capitalism will give way to socialism. No one can halt man's forward movement, just as no one can prevent day following night. (*Applause*)

Comrades, the German Democratic Republic is one of the outposts of the socialist commonwealth of nations. You in your Republic are building socialism under ceaseless enemy fire. Socialism is being consolidated under great difficulties, owing to the division of the country and to the obstacles raised by certain foreign forces who have no desire to see Germany a united, peace-loving and democratic state. Nevertheless, the working people of your Republic have made considerable progress in expanding the economy.

Much of the credit for this goes to the Socialist Unity Party of Germany which is organizing and rallying the working class and all the working people of the German Democratic Republic. Headed by such tried leaders as Wilhelm Pieck, Walter Ulbricht, Otto Grotewohl and other members of the Political Bureau, it is consistently carrying out the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the principles of proletarian internationalism. The working people see for themselves that it has no interests save those of the German people. (*Applause.*)

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany has rallied for the democratic development of Germany all the progressive forces of the German people united in the National Front of Democratic Germany.

With all our hearts we wish the Socialist Unity Party and its Central Committee, and all the parties united in the National Front, further success in the great cause of building socialism, in striving for a united, peace-loving, democratic Germany. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The growing strength of your Republic, the steady rise in output of its industry and agriculture prove unmistakably that the way it has taken is the sole correct way, one which opens grand constructive prospects for the German people.

The imperialists are doing everything to retard the advance of the socialist countries, to split our ranks. Hence, we should be on the alert, constantly safeguard and cherish the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries, the unity and solidarity of the Communist and Workers' parties.

It is a source of satisfaction that the relations between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany are distinguished by fraternal co-operation and complete mutual understanding. The Central Committee of our Party will do all in its power to develop and strengthen these relations so that the fraternal unity of all the Communist and Workers' parties standing for Marxism-Leninism shall grow and become stronger.

Reactionary circles are rattling the sabre, trying to intimidate the socialist countries. This is a foolish policy. We are not fainthearts. We have the wherewithal with which to meet uninvited guests properly, to deliver a shattering rebuff to any aggression against any country of the socialist camp. (*Stormy applause*)

But we Communists stand foursquare for the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence. We are for peace precisely because our faith in socialism, in its ultimate triumph, is unshakeable. We do not fear competition with capitalism, being firmly convinced that socialism will win in any competition with capitalism, both in economy and culture and in reaching a standard of living worthy of man's finest aspirations.

And it is because these noble goals can be reached quicker and more easily in conditions of peace that we are resolutely against war. We are against war also for the reason that, in view of the modern means of destruction, it would be a calamity for mankind. War is utterly alien to socialism, the socialist system does not need war. The Communists have never sought, nor do they seek now, to impose their system on any people by means of war. Their premise is that the establishment of a new social system is the internal affair of the peoples. As long as we have differ-

ent systems we must of necessity coexist peacefully and demonstrate which is better, we must compete not by way of perfecting means for slaughtering people, but in peaceful endeavours, in doing away with poverty and exploitation, in subordinating nature to man. We firmly believe that durable and lasting peace is possible. Our Communist Party has always been guided by these principles. (*Applause.*)

For well-nigh forty years, ever since the first Decree of Soviet power on peace, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has always been directed towards safeguarding peace and preventing aggression. And today, the desire to preserve peace is the keynote of the foreign policy of the Soviet state. Every honest person appreciates the significance of the Soviet Union's proposals for ending atomic and hydrogen bomb tests, banning these deadly weapons, destroying stockpiles of these weapons and reducing conventional armaments and armed forces. It is not the fault of the Soviet Union that these vital proposals have not yet found acceptance.

Some people in the West try hard to prove that it is necessary to equip the Bundeswehr with atomic weapons, to station American troops and erect foreign military bases in West Germany because, they say, West Germany is menaced from the East by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Even here they are not very original. They are piping an old tune in a new key. The purpose of these malicious fabrications is perfectly obvious. The West German militarists and their transatlantic partners want, as the Russian saying goes, to shift the blame from the sick head to the sound, and thus vindicate the arms drive and the preparation for a new war.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have never had, nor do they have now, any hostile intentions with respect to other countries, including West Germany. We are for peace among the nations. The Soviet Union looks on friendship and mutual understanding between the German

and Soviet peoples as the paramount guarantee of peace and security in Europe. If our peoples live in peace and friendship, if they pool their efforts for peace in Europe, it will be hard for the imperialists to unleash another war.

It has always been our desire, as it is now, that the German people should reunite their country as quickly as possible in a single, democratic, peace-loving state. With this democratic, peace-loving Germany we would be ready to have the closest friendship. If this Germany has not so far materialized, the reason is that the imperialist circles do not want a united, peace-loving Germany. They would like to see Germany merely as their militarist shock force in Europe.

The people of Germany have twice experienced national catastrophe. And it depends largely on them whether the imperialists will again manage to unleash another war. That is why, in the present conditions, the progressive forces in Germany, all who really have the interests of their country at heart, are pooling their efforts to curb the militarist and revanchist forces now raising their heads in West Germany. The peace-loving peoples expect the German nation and, above all, the working class of West Germany, to do all in their power to prevent the militarists from again taking the destiny of Germany into their hands.

The Communist Party, the league of Free German Youth and the German-Soviet Friendship Society have been banned in West Germany. Who can doubt that this is but a beginning? Those who have taken the criminal road of suppressing the democratic rights and freedoms of the working people, the Hitler road, will not stop halfway. The normal activities of the Social-Democratic Party, the trade unions and other democratic organizations of the working people are in jeopardy. The designs of the West German militarists are plain. They want to behead and disorganize the working class, strangle the growing movement for peace and international friendship and so free their hands in step-

ping up preparation of aggressive ventures against the peace-loving peoples.

This is reminiscent of the time of Hitler who also began with terror against the Communist Party and then suppressed the other democratic organizations and plunged humanity into the worst bloodbath of all times.

The German people cannot afford to forget the lessons of recent history.

Unity of action of the working class in the two parts of Germany is of special significance in the fight against the resurgence of militarism and the danger of a new war, against the onslaught launched by the West German militarists on the democratic rights of the working people. The workers of the G.D.R. know from experience that unity of their ranks is a potent force. The West German workers, too, are beginning to appreciate this.

In the ranks of the Social Democratic Party the number of supporters of unity of action and business contacts with the Socialist Unity Party is increasing daily. The meetings and conferences of representatives of the two parties in Leipzig, which are now becoming regular features and which are attended by hundreds of functionaries of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, are a striking indication of this movement for unity of action by the German working class.

The course towards unity of action by the German working class, steadfastly steered by the Socialist Unity Party, corresponds to the fundamental interests of the working class of the two parts of the country because only a united German working class can effectively combat the aggressive plans of German militarism.

The progressive forces of the world believe that the German working class, aware of its responsibility for the destiny of its country, for peace and security in Europe, will never countenance repetition of the past disunity when many of the finest Communists and Social-Democrats were thrown into jails and concentration camps, when fascism

cleared the way for war and brigandage. We believe that the German workers will be loyal to the revolutionary traditions of their class. (*Applause.*)

Dear friends, we have seen the sights of your wonderful city, have visited the Agricultural Exhibition which reflects the achievements of your agriculture, and the Kirov Plant whose output is widely known beyond the borders of the Republic. We have met and talked with workers, peasants and intellectuals.

The working people of your Republic support the policy of their workers' and peasants' government and the Socialist Unity Party—a policy which answers the fundamental interests of all Germans. We have seen, and are delighted with, the friendship of your working people for our people. Our people, too, entertain friendly feelings for the working people of the German Democratic Republic. We are united by the common tasks of the struggle for building a new society, for durable peace and security of the nations. (*Applause.*)

Permit me, then, dear comrades, to wish you further success in consolidating the German Democratic Republic, in building socialism!

May the friendship of our peoples live and endure forever!

Long live the working class, peasants and intelligentsia of the German Democratic Republic—the builders of the new society!

Long live the Socialist Unity Party and its Central Committee!

Long live world peace! *Stormy, prolonged applause*
Cries: “Friendship!” “Freundschaft!” “Friendship!”
“Freundschaft!”)

**SPEECH
AT A MEETING OF THE WORKING
PEOPLE OF BERLIN
DURING VISIT OF SOVIET PARTY
AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION
TO G.D.R.**

August 13, 1957

Dear Comrade Ulbricht,
Dear Comrade Grotewohl,
Dear comrades and friends,

It is with feelings of great emotion that we, members of the Party and Government Delegation of the Soviet Union, came to this meeting of the working people of the German capital, Berlin, who assembled in the square which bears the names of Marx and Engels. Today's meeting with you rounds off our visit to the German Democratic Republic.

Allow me first of all to express once again our great gratitude to the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Government of the German Democratic Republic for the invitation to visit your Republic, for the friendliness and warm hospitality. We whole-heartedly thank the President of the German Democratic Republic Comrade Wilhelm Pieck, the President of the People's Chamber Comrade Johannes Dieckmann, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the S.U.P.G. Comrade Walter Ulbricht, the Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic Comrade Otto Grotewohl, all members of the Political Bureau of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and members of the Government of the German Democratic Republic. We also express our gratitude and appreciation to the

leaders of parties affiliated with the National Front of Democratic Germany.

Our Party and Government Delegation has spent seven days in the German Democratic Republic. During our stay here we had friendly meetings and frank conversations on all the most important problems of interest to our Parties and our Governments. These were very fruitful meetings. It is a pleasure to take part in such meetings. We had no differences, there were no problems such as could have given rise to disputes or even to more differences in understanding. We have complete unity of views both in assessing the situation within each of our parties and countries and in assessing the international situation and the foreign policies pursued by the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union and by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Government of the German Democratic Republic, and this is expressed in the Joint Statement we have just signed. (*Applause.*)

In such conditions very favourable opportunities have existed, and exist now, for the further strengthening and development of socialist relations between our countries, of comradely cooperation and joint struggle for the consolidation of peace and the security of the nations.

Where is the source of the community of our views, our unity? This source is the unshakeable principles of Marxism-Leninism. They were expressed in the historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in the decisions of the Central Committees of our Parties. Their implementation is the cardinal task of all our activities. (*Applause.*)

Comrades, in the Soviet Union workers and peasants, the working people have been in power for 40 years now. The efforts of the Soviet people have been crowned with the greatest of victories: they have built socialism and are confidently marching on the road to communism. The working people of your Republic, having taken power into their own hands, also embarked on the road of socialist construc-

tion. You have effected fundamental democratic changes, abolished land ownership by the landlords and monopoly capital, these economic and political mainstays of German militarism.

The growth and consolidation of your young socialist state in the heart of Europe is of epochal significance.

History shows that success in the struggle of the working people depends on what party heads the working masses, what its policy is, whose interests it champions. This is the main thing. The German Democratic Republic has such a party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, which is loyal to the banner of Marxism-Leninism and is doing everything for the peaceful development of the German Democratic Republic as the bulwark of a united, peace-loving and democratic Germany. (*Prolonged applause.*) It stands guard over the interests of the working class, all the working people of Germany, and enjoys, as we became convinced, deserved prestige among the working folk of your Republic.

The Western bourgeois press is spreading many calumnious fabrications about the leaders of the S.U.P.G. and the Government of the German Democratic Republic. These methods are not new. The enemies of the working class, the enemies of Marxism-Leninism do not disdain the foulest means to slander the leaders of the labour movement, active organizers of the working class in its struggle against capitalism. But the result is the opposite of what they expect.

The working people of the German Democratic Republic support the home and foreign policies of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Government of the German Democratic Republic, trust their leadership and no vicious outbursts and slanderous fabrications will be able to undermine this trust. (*Stormy applause.*)

Some men even try to invent fables about our attitude to the leadership of the S.U.P.G. and the Government of your Republic. The enemies would like to find some fissure in our relations, but here, too, bitter disappointment awaits them. (*Applause*)

The Party and Government Delegation of the Soviet Union declares that we fully subscribe to the policy pursued by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and its leading core, headed by Comrade Ulbricht who is a loyal fighter for democracy and socialism (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cries: "Long live the Socialist Unity Party of Germany!"*) We have full understanding with the Government of the German Democratic Republic headed by Comrade Otto Grotewohl (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cries: "Long live the Government of the German Democratic Republic!" "Hurrah!"*) We greet all the members of the Political Bureau of the C.C. of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the members of the Government, who dedicate all their energies to strengthening the German Democratic Republic. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin taught us that a revolutionary party of the working class must be a party of a special type, militant, closely connected with the masses, united organizationally, irreconcilable towards its class enemies, irreconcilable towards revisionism, opportunism. At the same time it must be flexible, must be able to find a correct solution of any problem, must not yield its class positions on anything, must always keep pure its ideological weapon in the struggle against the capitalist system which is outliving its age, the struggle for the new, the progressive, for communism.

On all these questions we also have full unanimity with the leaders of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. (*Stormy applause.*)

We not only had talks with the leaders of your Republic, but also were given the opportunity of visiting many cities and communities, industrial establishments, agricultural cooperatives, people's estates, scientific institutions, the opportunity of talking with workers, peasants and intellectuals. We had hearty and frank talks with friends, in the course of which we touched on many questions the working folk of the German Democratic Republic and Soviet people take to heart. We had meetings and conversations which left an in-

delible impression on the members of the Party and Government Delegation of the Soviet Union. We found cordiality and friendly feelings for the Soviet people, whom we represent.

Wherever we were, whomever we talked to, we always heard the moving word: "Friendship," "Friendship," "Friendship." (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cries: "Hurrah!"*)

Indeed, comrades, the friendship of our peoples is truly the greatest gain which became possible only on a socialist foundation. History developed so that there was no little in common between our countries but, on the other hand, it is a fact that our countries twice fought against each other in the lifetime of one generation. The first war was started by the Germany of Kaiser Wilhelm, the second war between our countries was unleashed by the perfidious attack of Hitler fascism on the Soviet Union. In this war fascism pursued not only imperialist, predatory aims, but also class aims: the destruction of the first socialist state in the world. Hitler wanted to play the part of hangman of the revolutionary movement of the working class, of our socialist state.

Because of various reasons Hitlerism succeeded in poisoning millions of Germans with its propaganda, including many workers, peasants and intellectuals; they were in the ranks of the Hitler army.

We must assess events historically. Of course, we cannot live in the past, but the past should be taken into account in order to give a correct historical explanation and, what is most important, not to repeat the mistakes of the past.

The most devastating war unleashed by the Hitlerites left among the peoples of the Soviet Union a feeling of burning hatred for fascism, this most terroristic dictatorship of imperialist reaction; there was also some feeling of bitterness towards the German people in general. Soviet men and women, of course, have never identified the German people with the Hitler criminals. Class consciousness told Soviet

men and women that in a bourgeois state there can be no unity and no political solidarity because it consists of different classes and it is impossible to reconcile their interests. Nevertheless, the gang of Hitler criminals succeeded in fanning the war conflagration which claimed the lives of millions of our people.

When our delegation started out for your country, a question and, we might say, a certain anxiety arose in our minds as to the sentiments and the mood of the Germans today, after the war, after the disaster and defeat unexampled in history. We knew that the German people hate fascism, Hitlerism, which is the main culprit responsible for all their calamities and suffering. But we wondered whether there was not still in the hearts of the German people some trace of ill-feeling against the peoples of the Soviet Union.

We thought that such questions were natural and legitimate both on your part and on our part. After the tour of your Republic, after the meetings and talks with the working people, after everything we had seen, I want to tell you about our impressions. We were deeply touched by the warm sentiments of growing friendship and the attention, which could not but attest to the striving of the working people of the German Democratic Republic to strengthen and develop friendly relations between our countries. (*Stormy applause.*) We had very moving meetings with workers, peasants, and intellectuals, young and elderly people who, in groups or singly, expressed their sincere feelings of friendship for the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The propaganda exertions of the Western press look wretched and miserable; it engages in fabrications about some kind of forcible means with the help of which the German population was allegedly made to welcome the Soviet delegation. (*General laughter.*) Can a man in such cases be made to do what does not come from the bottom of his heart? One ought to see these greetings, hear these cheers! People can be made to come out in the streets, but if they

are unfriendly their faces will be cold. We, however, saw manifestations of the warmest feelings for us, representatives of the Soviet people. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*) These sentiments were coming from the bottom of the heart and they cannot be aroused by any orders. (*Applause*)

Comrades!

We have already spoken about the Soviet Union's stand on the reunification of Germany, a question which agitates the German people. This stand is clear-cut and definite.

We want to see Germany united in one democratic state which would pursue a policy of peace and friendship with all countries. (*Stormy applause.*) Having met workers, peasants, representatives of the German intelligentsia, we became convinced that the absolute majority of the population of your Republic sincerely want this, want to see their Fatherland united in one democratic, peace-loving state (*Stormy applause*)

War is loathful to the German people, just as to the peoples of other countries, for it twice led Germany to national disaster. The men and women we spoke with in Germany, and we talked to many in town and country, told us that the German people should strengthen and develop friendly relations with the Soviet Union and other peaceful countries. (*Applause.*) The joint efforts of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the entire German people in the struggle for peace would raise an insurmountable obstacle to all advocates of unleashing another war not only in Europe, but also throughout the world. (*Applause*)

And this is really so, comrades.

Unfortunately, forces which adhere to entirely different positions are at the helm in West Germany. The role of the main herald of these forces has been assumed by the Federal Chancellor, Herr Adenauer, who still thinks of reuniting Germany "from positions of strength." He does not reckon with the lessons of history and the national interests of the German people; the policy of Adenauer's Government proceeds not from the interests of peace, but from the desire

to satisfy militarist and revanchist aspirations. Such a policy is fraught with grave consequences, for which the German people would pay first and foremost.

We say: Herr Adenauer, the past cannot be brought back. (*Stormy applause Cries: "Right!"*) If you really want to reunite Germany, approach this matter from positions of reason and not "from positions of strength" (*applause*), taking into account the interests of the German people, the real situation at present. And the real situation is such that there exist two German states with different social and political systems. You do not want to come in contact with the Government of the German Democratic Republic, but that will not make it disappear. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers of approval.*)

There is one real way of reuniting Germany, this is the way of negotiation and agreement between the two German states. The re-establishment of Germany's unity is first and foremost a matter for the German people themselves. (*Stormy applause.*)

The Soviet Government has more than once stated that it wanted to have good relations with both German states. But it must be said outright that the ruling circles of West Germany, far from taking any steps to improve relations with the Soviet Union, on the contrary, are doing everything to aggravate these relations.

Indeed, how can one describe the outbursts against the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, which West German statesmen often allow themselves in their recent speeches, otherwise than a desire to aggravate relations between our states? In these statements the Soviet Union is proclaimed to be the "deadly enemy." Taking such a stand towards the Soviet Union, the ruling circles and the press of West Germany complain about the allegedly sharp tone of my speech in the People's Chamber. (*Laughter.*) Evidently, Chancellor Adenauer would like that he and his ministers should be able to sling mud at the Soviet Union, to slander

the Soviet people without any rebuff. Are not these claims too inordinate? (*Applause.*)

The problem of repatriation of Germans from the Soviet Union is regarded by Adenauer as the cardinal question which allegedly prevents an improvement in relations between our countries. He pitilessly plays on the sentiments of mothers, wives and children who lost their sons, husbands and fathers in the late sanguinary war.

It is natural that many people to this day cannot reconcile themselves to the idea of the death of their relatives, inasmuch as they did not receive official notification about their death from the Hitlerite authorities during the war. These people think that their relatives are still alive whereas they perished during the war.

Yes, in this war very many people perished but they are listed as missing. And so Adenauer is inhumanly exploiting the sentiments of people who lost their relatives in the war. When Adenauer was in Moscow and raised the question of repatriating German citizens who remained in the Soviet Union, we met him halfway and reached an agreement. And we implemented this agreement. Herr Adenauer knows this better than anyone else. For what purpose is this question raised again? Of course, not to improve relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. One cannot but see in this an evil desire to inflame passions.

Posing as a hero allegedly fighting for the return of thousands upon thousands of men to their families, you, Herr Adenauer, seem to want to console the grief of the mothers, wives and children of these men, but actually you mock at human misfortune, because nothing can resurrect the dead.

This means that you deliberately want to continue sowing seeds of discord, want psychologically to condition the German people for another war.

I was told that during the late war you engaged in gardening. Gardening is an occupation which ennobles the soul of man. But can one regard as noble the things you, Herr

Adenauer, are doing, mocking at the memory of the men who perished in the war, rubbing salt into the mental wounds of people cold-bloodedly and methodically? (*Cries of indignation*)

During the late war I was with the Soviet troops all the time both during our retreat and during our advance. (*Applause.*) Both I and Comrade Mikoyan who, together with me, is standing here before you, suffered great personal bereavement in the war: both Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan and I lost our sons. They were pilots and failed to return from combat missions in defending their Homeland. Our sons are also listed as missing. Consequently we, too, can demand from Germany the return of our sons. But I am certain they perished, although their bodies were not found. Our sons were consumed by the flames of the war. And there are hundreds of thousands of people such as we, whose relatives were lost without trace during the war. In general, many million people perished during the war.

Moreover, we must not forget that of the several million Soviet civilians who during the war years had been transported to Germany, hundreds of thousands also perished and did not return to their relatives. They are also regarded as missing and the Soviet people could demand of Germany their return. If we were to present demands of such a nature to each other, what would this lead to? To peace? No. This would sow the seeds of animosity and hatred. And this is precisely what is wanted by the men who are preparing another war.

We must energetically condemn such a policy which leads to another war. (*Stormy applause.*) This policy directed against the interests of the people is needed only by those who make fortunes on war and on the suffering of the people.

Comrades, during the stay of our delegation in the German Democratic Republic the bourgeois press wrote much to the effect that we engage in propaganda, seeking to

weaken the position of Adenauer and his Christian-Democratic Party.

We are political leaders and in speeches before the working people expound our views. Call this propaganda, if you wish. But our statements, or, as they call it, "propaganda," are directed at abolishing the cold war, at establishing friendly relations with the German people. I think I will not err if I say that the German people are interested in friendship with the Soviet people no less than the Soviet people. (*Stormy applause.*) We stand for the development of the broadest economic and cultural relations with the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, with all the countries. Is this a bad aim? We sincerely strive for the safeguarding of world peace. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Militarists, all the advocates of the cold war, are irritated by such words as "peace," "peaceful coexistence," "disarmament." If you, gentlemen, were to engage in such propaganda, you would only be acclaimed, because the people want a reduction of international tension and abolition of the cold war. (*Applause.*)

As for elections in the Federal Republic of Germany, we want to say again that this is a domestic affair of the people in West Germany. We will make no secret of the fact that when we were asked during our visit what we thought about the elections in West Germany we said that for the German people, for the cause of peace it would be better if deputies were elected to the West German Bundestag who would cut short the cold war policy, the policy "from positions of strength," the policy of militarizing and turning Germany into the main base for waging atomic war. (*Applause.*)

The Soviet people are sincerely striving for the abolition of the cold war and the establishment of friendly relations among all states. The proposals of the Soviet Government on disarmament are clear-cut and understandable and they are supported by all upright people. Naturally, it is difficult to convince people who benefit from the arms race, who adhere to the policy "from positions of strength." No reason-

able argument can have any effect on them. In discussing disarmament problems, the representatives of the Western powers are doing all they can to drag out the matter endlessly and to put off a settlement of this vitally important question

We shall continue to strive for agreement on disarmament, in the first place on prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, on discontinuation of nuclear weapon tests. (*Applause.*) This is demanded by the peoples and we are convinced that they will achieve their demand. (*Prolonged applause*)

Comrades!

The great leaders of the proletariat Marx, Engels, Lenin created the brilliant teaching on the ways of social development, gave the working class a mighty weapon in the struggle against capitalism, for socialism. Today everyone sees that Marxism-Leninism has gripped the minds of millions of working people. In many countries the teaching of Marxism-Leninism is being translated into reality. The Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, the working people of many other countries, following the path indicated by Marx, Engels, Lenin, have scored historic victories.

A qualitative change in the position of the working class, the position of the working people has occurred in the socialist countries. While in capitalist conditions the working class fought for the right to dispose of the products of their labour, for the right to reconstruct society in the interests of the working people, in socialist countries the working class, the labouring people have become masters of their destiny. Consequently, the working class has won not only the right to fight for its ideals, but won power and created a force to defend its gains. (*Prolonged applause.*)

It is no secret that the imperialists have tried, and will try, to encroach on the gains of the working people. Therefore we must strengthen international solidarity, strengthen the unity of the countries of the socialist camp. (*Stormy applause.*)

To uphold their gains the working people of the socialist countries must have force, armed force included. It may be said: how come Khrushchov, advocating peace, at the same time speaks about armed forces? If we were confident that the ruling circles in the countries where the bourgeoisie is in power abandoned the employment of force against the socialist countries, we would have no need to strengthen our armed forces. But inasmuch as the Western powers are arming, are drawing up plans for aggressive war against the socialist countries, we would be committing a crime if we were to slacken our efforts in creating the wherewithal for defending the socialist states from encroachments by the imperialists. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have forces which can uphold the cause of the working class, the cause of peace, democracy and socialism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We did not intend, nor do we intend now, to use this force for imposing the socialist system on other countries. We firmly adhere to the principle of peaceful coexistence of states irrespective of their social systems.

Dear comrades!

Tomorrow our Party and Government Delegation will leave for home. We are carrying away with us feelings of friendship for the German people, are leaving convinced that still greater efforts must be exerted to consolidate friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the German people, between the peoples of all the socialist countries, to strengthen and develop friendship with all the forces working for world peace. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Allow us once again to thank you and, through you, all the working people of the German Democratic Republic for these warm meetings, for your friendliness and hospitality. (*Applause.*)

Many of our German friends have asked us to convey hearty greetings to Soviet men and women, to the Soviet people. (*Prolonged applause.*) On returning to the Soviet

Union we certainly shall comply with these wishes. (*Prolonged applause*)

Good-bye, comrades. We wish the working people of the German Democratic Republic fresh success in socialist construction, in the struggle for a united, peace-loving, democratic Germany. (*Stormy applause.*)

N. S. Khrushchov then said in German:

Long live the German Democratic Republic! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live friendship between the Soviet and German peoples! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cries: "Friendship!" "Friendship!" "Hurrah!"*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Friendship! Good-bye, good-bye! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cries: "Long live friendship between our peoples!" The audience scan "Friendship!" "Friendship!" "Friendship!" "Hurrah!"*)

SPEECH
AT A MEETING OF THE WORKING
PEOPLE OF MOSCOW
UPON RETURN OF SOVIET PARTY
AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION
FROM G.D.R.

August 14, 1957

Dear comrades,
Dear Muscovites,

The Party and Government Delegation of the Soviet Union have just returned from the German Democratic Republic where we went on a visit of friendship at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

The eight days which we spent among our German friends enabled us to have comprehensive talks with Party and Government leaders. We visited many towns and villages, met workers, peasants and intellectuals, and learned at first hand of the state and cultural development in the German Democratic Republic, the first worker-and-peasant state in German history.

We can say with deep satisfaction that our visit was a success. It not only justified but even surpassed all our expectations. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Yesterday, when I addressed the working people of Berlin, I spoke of what we had in mind when we set out on our visit. We were aware, naturally, of the change for the better that has taken place in the minds of the Germans in recent years with regard to the Soviet Union. But we also had some apprehensions. After all, one cannot forget that twice

in the lifetime of one generation our peoples have been embroiled in sanguinary war which brought both sides much sorrow and suffering. For decades the Prussian Junkers and the German imperialists, especially during the fascist dictatorship, had poisoned the German people with the venom of chauvinism and hatred for our country.

The horrors of the Hitler war are still fresh in the memory of the nations. Fascism wanted to destroy our socialist state and extirpate the great gains won by the working class, by the working people of the Soviet Union. The war cost us and the Germans millions of lives. There is hardly a family both here and in Germany that did not lose someone. And the consequences, naturally, are not easily overcome. And human feelings cannot be ignored. But it is necessary correctly to understand and assess the events in order to prevent a possible repetition of the bitter yesterday.

We say this not for the purpose of raking up the past, but to emphasize that the sentiment in Germany is a matter of our relationship with the German people, it is a question of stepping over the yesterday which brought us such sorrow and tears, of building relations between our peoples on the foundation of peace and friendship. Peace and friendship between the Soviet and German peoples is the key to lasting peace and security in Europe, and not only in Europe. (*Applause.*)

What, then, are our impressions from the numerous meetings with the working people of the German Democratic Republic? Everywhere we met with hospitality and understanding and sensed the anxiety felt by every honest person for peace. We were conscious of the fervent desire of the Germans to strengthen the peace forces, to prevent war and promote friendship between our peoples and other peoples.

In Berlin, Leipzig, Magdeburg and Rostock, in all the towns and villages we visited, we heard in the crowded streets and squares, in Russian and in German, a word near to the hearts of the people—the word “friendship.” There were touching scenes when crowds of people, groups and

even individuals of different ages expressed their sympathy and friendship for us, the representatives of the Soviet people. (*Applause.*)

Of course, we know that among the Germans there are those who are not kindly disposed towards the Soviet people. But nowadays it is not they who set the tune. We are firmly convinced that the overwhelming majority of Germans sincerely wish to live in friendship with the Soviet people, to act together with all peace-loving forces to prevent another war. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Leninist foreign policy of our country has done much also with respect to the German people. This policy of friendship and cooperation among nations and the fraternal aid rendered to the German Democratic Republic have changed the outlook of the ordinary German. The Socialist Unity Party, its correct policy, expressing the interests of the entire German nation, has been highly instrumental in educating the German people, in inculcating the spirit of peace and friendship. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, the workers, peasants and intellectuals whom we met requested us to convey heartfelt friendly greetings to the Soviet people. We promised to do so and we derive deep satisfaction from fulfilling their request. (*Stormy applause.*)

In our speeches we, the members of the Soviet Party and Government Delegation, said that our people have the most friendly feelings for the working people of the German Democratic Republic. We said that we have always fought and always will fight with all our energy to strengthen world peace and implement the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that we shall follow undeviatingly the road charted by the great Lenin. (*Stormy applause.*)

During our stay we had meetings and talks with the leaders of the Socialist Unity Party, with the leaders of the other parties affiliated to the National Front of Democratic Germany and with the Government of the Republic.

The features of these meetings and talks were cordial friendship, candour and complete understanding. We are glad to tell you that there was neither controversy nor difference on any of the points discussed and that identity of views of both our Parties and Governments was disclosed. (*Prolonged applause.*)

A joint statement was signed at the end. There is no need, I think, to tell you in detail about it—it is published in today's papers. It should be emphasized that the joint statement corresponds wholly not only to the interests and sentiments of the peoples of the Soviet Union and German Democratic Republic, but also to the interests of strengthening the unity of all the socialist countries, of strengthening world peace. (*Applause.*)

Like all Germans, the working people of the Democratic Republic are worried about reunification. On behalf of the Soviet Government and all the Soviet people, we told the People's Chamber that the Soviet Union fully approves and supports the programme for peaceful and democratic reunification outlined in the statement issued by the Government of the German Democratic Republic. This is the sole real and correct way. (*Applause.*)

The West German rulers take an opposite view. Herr Adenauer thinks in terms of solving the German question "from positions of strength." But that policy is fraught with grave consequences. However, should the West German militarists lose their heads and risk armed force as a solution to the German question they will have to deal not only with the German Democratic Republic, but with all the signatories to the Warsaw Treaty. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, the strength of the socialist countries lies in their unity and solidarity. The stronger the socialist camp the more difficult it will be for the imperialists to unleash another war. Each socialist country, by developing its economy and culture, by winning fresh success in all spheres of its economy, adds thereby to the might of the socialist camp as a whole.

So, comrades, let us work still harder to advance our industry and agriculture, raise labour productivity and, in this way, raise standards of living, build more houses and ensure fuller satisfaction of the spiritual and material requirements of the working people. (*Stormy applause.*)

Comrades, allow me from this rostrum to express, on behalf of the Party and Government Delegation and on your behalf, our sincere gratitude to Comrade Wilhelm Pieck, President of the German Democratic Republic (*applause*), to the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party and its First Secretary, Comrade Walter Ulbricht (*applause*), to the Government of the German Democratic Republic and to Comrade Otto Grotewohl, Prime Minister, (*applause*), to the leaders of the National Front and to all the working people of the German Democratic Republic for the warm reception and hospitality accorded us as representatives of the Soviet people. (*Stormy applause.*)

Let us wish the working people of the German Democratic Republic further success in the great cause of building socialism on German soil (*Prolonged applause.*)

Long live Soviet-German friendship! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the peoples of the Soviet Union who, under the leadership of our Party and under the banner of Lenin, are successfully accomplishing the historic task of building communism! (*Stormy applause.*)

Forward to new victories! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
PUT BY J. RESTON,
NEW YORK TIMES
CHIEF DIPLOMATIC
CORRESPONDENT**

October 7, 1957

J. Reston, chief diplomatic correspondent of the *New York Times*, requested an interview with N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The request was granted and the interview took place on October 7.

Reston's questions and Khrushchov's answers are given below.

Reston: The problem of peaceful coexistence and, particularly, what both you and we mean by the free exchange of ideas and information.

Khrushchov: Our position in these matters is well known. We have always been and continue to be for peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, for peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries. Peace is the cornerstone of our foreign policy. Why? Because in our country there are no classes interested in seizing foreign lands and enslaving other peoples, or in profiting by the arms race. Because we need peace in order to build communism, to create an abundance of material values for all the members of our Soviet society.

We stand for peaceful coexistence not because we are weak, not because we are afraid of the imperialists, but because a new war, involving modern lethal weapons, like thermonuclear bombs and the means to deliver them, like

the intercontinental ballistic missile, would spell death for millions upon millions of people and the destruction of enormous material values, the fruit of the labour of many generations.

We are Communists, and the communist ideology is the world's most humane ideology. We believe there is nothing more precious than man himself, and, hence, will spare no effort to deliver mankind from the menace of another world carnage

I think the capitalist powers ought to be no less interested in peaceful coexistence than the Soviet Union. It is common knowledge that as a result of previous wars many countries broke with the capitalist system and now make up the world system of socialism. A third world war would end only in the downfall of capitalism.

We coexist with you on one and the same planet, where there is enough room for all, but where distances, due to modern supersonic aircraft, the development of intercontinental rockets, and other achievements of science and engineering, have become much shorter before the eyes of our generation. For that reason we ought more than ever to show good sense and learn to coexist like good neighbours.

Of course, contradictions exist, and will continue to exist, between the socialist and capitalist worlds, the result of the operation of objective laws of social progress. But if people all over the world consciously bend every effort to prevent another war, they will be able to lend to the struggle between the socialist and capitalist systems the form of peaceful competition, mainly an economic competition, that is, a competition in peaceful production, in raising the living standards of all the population. To do this, however, we must banish the war threat, ban atomic and hydrogen weapons and destroy stockpiles of these weapons, drastically reduce conventional armaments, armed forces and military budgets, establish relations of confidence among states, pull down every artificial barrier in

the way of international trade and cultural links, respect the independence of other countries and not interfere in their domestic affairs.

As for the exchange of ideas and information, it should serve precisely these aims. It should serve to strengthen mutual understanding and friendship, not sow the poisonous seeds of suspicion and hostility among nations. It should promote, not undermine, peaceful coexistence between states with differing systems. We are for this kind of exchange.

Reston: Do you consider, Mr. First Secretary, that only the capitalist states would be destroyed as a result of a new war and communism would prevail?

Khrushchov. In saying that a new world war could end only in capitalism's crash, we do not mean to say at all that the socialist countries would not have any losses in that war. With modern weapons of destruction such as they are, the losses would, of course, be colossal. But we are convinced that socialism will live on, while capitalism will not survive. For despite great losses, mankind will not only survive, but will continue to develop. The peoples will draw the conclusion that a system engendering wars and causing them such misery and suffering cannot be tolerated any longer. Wars can be started only by imperialists. And if a war breaks out, the peoples would want to do away once and for all with a social system engendering wars and establish a socialist order in their countries.

Some may think that Communists are interested in war, since it will lead to the victory of socialism. But only our enemies can present matters so. We are against such inhumanity. We Communists never sought and never will seek to achieve our objectives by such dreadful means. We proceed from the premise that wars are not necessary for the victory of socialism. We are convinced that in the peaceful competition of socialism and capitalism, victory will be on the side of socialism, while capitalism will

inevitably vanish from the historical arena just as was the case with feudalism which gave way to capitalism.

It is very important that you should understand our viewpoint on this matter.

Reston: In enumerating the various types of modern weapons, you made no reference to the fact that the latest achievements in space travel could also harbour a military danger. Do you consider it quite possible to establish control over these newest means so that they should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes?

Khrushchov: If we succeed in reaching agreement on disarmament—and the main thing is for our two countries to come to an agreement—if we are guided by the noble aspirations of preserving peace, it is quite possible to bring about a situation in which these means would serve peaceful purposes exclusively. I made no reference to them because this is already known, because it is already a past stage, and science can produce new and more important discoveries, including means of destruction.

The present period is something in the nature of a turning point. Military experts hold that planes, whether bombers or fighters, are on the decline. Bombers have a speed and altitude which make them vulnerable to attack by rockets. Fighters, on the other hand, now have such a great speed that their use against fighters is becoming difficult, while against bombers they are also insufficiently effective. Moreover, fighters have men on them whom, of course, we do not want to lose.

I am not implying that this is true of our country only. Although the United States has not got the missile today, you will have it too, since science is constantly developing. The same applies to the Soviet Union: if today we do not have something that you have, we will have it too. That also is a form of competition. But we do not want such competition, we want peaceful relations, not the stockpiling of means of destruction. I think I will not reveal any military secrets if I tell you that we now have all the rock-

ets we need: long-range rockets, intermediate-range rockets and close-range rockets. Of course, these are not the limits of what can be achieved, for engineering is not marking time, but these means fully ensure our defence.

I want you to understand me correctly. I have said all this not to intimidate anyone or to exert political pressure on the public. All these things are realities. When we announced the successful testing of an intercontinental missile, some U.S. statesmen did not believe us. The Soviet Union, you see, was saying it had something it did not really have. Now that we have successfully launched an Earth satellite, only technically ignorant people can doubt this. The U.S.A. has no intercontinental ballistic missile, otherwise it would also have easily launched a satellite of its own. We can launch satellites because we have a carrier for them, namely, the ballistic missile.

Such are the actual facts. We must not deceive either ourselves or others. As statesmen we must do everything possible to prevent war and to reach agreement on important international problems, including the problem of disarmament. We are prepared even now to conclude reasonable agreements on all problems of disarmament, to considerably reduce our armed forces, or even abolish our army, retaining only a militia to protect honest people from thieves and crooks, who, unfortunately, still exist. But we do not need any wars.

Reston: I agree with you that we are now at something like a turning point. We in the United States are at a somewhat special kind of turning point. The fact is that in about two years the executive power in our country will pass from people born in the nineteenth century to people born in the twentieth. This process will begin already in 1960. Will not too long a period elapse before these new people win sufficient political prestige to reach at least that degree of agreement with the Soviet Union which has been reached by President Eisenhower? Don't you think that it is necessary to reach agreement in the next eighteen months to two

years, so as not to put this off for about six years, if not ten? Are you taking this factor into consideration?

Khrushchov: We take a different view of the future and we have a different criterion in appraising the policy of this or that country. I know what you mean since I have read about this point of view in the American press, but I think that such a viewpoint is wrong. We believe that the people of the older generation are clever, but the people of the next generation will be probably even more clever. But then, this is a somewhat crude comparison. The point, of course, is not when this or that statesman was born—in the 19th, 20th or even 21st century. In the 21st century society will have risen to a much higher level in its development.

Irrespective of that, we are ready even today to sign an agreement with President D. Eisenhower acceptable to both sides and in the interests of world peace. But the U.S.A. is uncooperative, putting forward a number of such conditions which are known to be unacceptable to the U.S.S.R. These are conditions of the strong for the weak, they sound something like an ultimatum. But we are not one of the states of America, we are a sovereign socialist state with our own philosophy, which differs radically from the capitalist philosophy and is, for one thing, immeasurably more humane than the capitalist philosophy. Agreements must be sought which would not be politically detrimental to one side or the other.

I am aware that you, as a journalist, are held in esteem by your readers. I ask you, therefore, to convey to the public in your country that our people and our country want peace. We want to reach agreement with the United States, but only on a footing of equality, without *diktat* or discrimination. Proposals which place the Soviet Union in a position of inequality cannot be accepted by the Soviet Government. One sometimes gets the impression that some of your statesmen simply do not want to reach any agreement with the Soviet Union. At times they talk of progress in the disarmament discussions, but this progress does not

exist. I think, however, that President Eisenhower and Mr. Stassen want to find a road to agreement. But in your country there are forces which are opposed to this. For example, it appears to us that your Secretary of State does not want what Mr. Eisenhower is working for. I met Mr. Dulles at Geneva and I recall having a frank conversation with him at a dinner given by President Eisenhower in honour of the Soviet delegation.

Apparently some U.S. statesmen hold that conditions are not yet ripe for an improvement in Soviet-American relations, for the establishment of greater mutual understanding between our countries, for the attainment of agreement by reasonable negotiation.

The President of the United States said recently that the United States could not give up testing nuclear weapons. This means that the U.S. President, too, does not want agreement on this matter, evidently believing that nuclear weapon tests will give the United States some advantages. But we are conducting tests, too. On October 8, we shall announce that we have held another hydrogen bomb test. This gives us, too, certain advantages. But these are means of destruction, it is not our aim to increase them without end. It is simply appalling if this question, too, is approached from a commercial point of view, in terms of monopoly profits. At any rate, this is alien to us, Communists.

What is to be done? It is necessary to work for disarmament. But with technical progress, conditions for disarmament change too. For example, in our statements we at one time proposed organizing control posts at airfields as one of the measures of control. Conditions have now changed and, if you study our latest proposals, you will no longer find any mention of control posts at airfields, since the newest means, specifically rockets, require no airfields, and it is useless to create control posts to watch obsolete aircraft.

As you see, conditions have changed and proposals have changed. But we are firmly for disarmament. There are still reactionary militarist forces in the world which are preparing war and which do not want disarmament, fearing to lose their profits. The ordinary people have nothing to fear. The capitalists, however, are worried about their profits and are squeezing gold out of the blood of the workers. As for how they do this, you know yourself.

Reston: On the subject of the artificial Earth satellite, I wanted to ask you, Mr. Khrushchov, whether you were present when it was launched and whether, unlike President Eisenhower, you have ever seen nuclear weapons tested.

Khrushchov: I'll answer both your questions at once: no, I have not seen this. When the satellite was launched, they phoned to tell me that the rocket had taken the right course and that the satellite was already circling the Earth. I congratulated the group of engineers and technicians on this outstanding achievement and calmly went to bed.

Reston: Permit me to ask, why the launching of the satellite was kept secret? It seemed to me that it was agreed to give advance notice of the launching of a satellite. The scientists of the world could then prepare their instruments for observing it.

Khrushchov: No such agreement exists. If we had given advance notice on the date of the satellite's launching, we would again have been accused of just talking nonsense for the psychological effect on the peoples of the capitalist countries, of simply bragging. That is why we decided to launch our satellite quietly and modestly, and to make the announcement when it was already revolving around the Earth.

When we tested an intercontinental ballistic missile, some people did not believe us. As for the satellite, in some parts of the globe it has been seen even with the naked eye. We think it better this way, more convincing. True, even now one "wise" American military man has said that "the

Soviet Earth satellite is just a hunk of iron which anyone can launch."

Reston: How does Mr. Khrushchov picture the Soviet Union and the world as a whole in another forty years?

Khrushchov: You want to know my opinion as to what the Soviet Union and the world will be like in forty years? Forty years in our changing world is not a short period. It is difficult, of course, to foresee all the zigzags of history, but it can be said about the fundamental line of development that in conditions of peace the Soviet Union will, in a shorter period than forty years, by virtue of the difference in the rate of development of our countries, leave the United States of America far behind in the level of industrial and agricultural production per head of the population, if the United States develops along capitalist lines. In our country the level of productive forces will be immeasurably higher than now, all the conditions will have been created for manufacturing an abundance of various goods and products, working hours will have been reduced to a minimum, since science and engineering will have made considerable progress. In short, our country will assuredly develop in accordance with Marxist-Leninist teaching about the building of a communist society.

As for the changes which will take place during this period in the world, it can quite confidently be said that if the peoples succeed in curbing the forces of aggression and the world is rid of the horrors of a thermonuclear war, mankind will forge ahead with seven-league strides in all fields of development. Changes in the world will proceed in the direction well described by Marx, Engels and Lenin in their theoretical works. We Communists have deep faith in the triumph of Marxist-Leninist teaching. I think that for the majority of mankind the great vital power of this teaching is now becoming clearer and clearer.

Reston. Do you foresee that the present policy of granting a greater measure of political freedom in your country will continue for the next two generations? Do you

foresee in the future a greater measure of peaceful coexistence of ideas inside your country, greater freedom for dissent? Is that how you picture the Soviet Union's road during the next two generations?

Khrushchov: Your questions show that you have a very poor knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory. You are opposed to this theory. You should study it better, then perhaps you would stop combating, or, at any rate, would be better equipped to combat it.

According to Marxist-Leninist teaching, with the development of socialist society and its institutions, with the development of man in that society, the rise of his cultural standards, and the education of new moral qualities in people, there will no longer be any need for a number of state bodies required now to put down the attempts of the enemies of socialism to deprive the working people of their great gains or to introduce various abnormalities into the life of our country. When our society reaches the stage of communism, only those institutions will remain which are needed to organize the normal life of society, for example, the further development of industry, farming and culture, the promotion of the standard of living, etc. We have no exploiting classes even now, but then we will have no classes and no class distinctions. Under communism there will be genuine freedom, fraternity and equality of all people in society. True, we have different ideas about freedom.

Incidentally, how old are you, Mr. Reston?

Reston: Forty-eight.

Khrushchov: I think that you will live to see the time when a communist society is built, and you will then regret that you came to understand the advantages of socialism so late. Probably, by that time, you will have turned from an opponent of socialism into an ardent supporter of it and will be very sorry that you were not able earlier to appreciate the beneficial effect of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

I trust that you are not offended at my words about your being poorly versed in Marxism. Or do you regard that as a commendation?

Reston: I am not offended in the least, Mr. Khrushchov, nor do I regard it as a commendation, since, of course, I should know more about this teaching. But I would like to say that we fail to understand, especially considering your implicit faith in the future, why after forty years of Soviet power, when people in your country have reached such a degree of material progress, you will not allow a greater degree of freedom in your country. Why, for instance, must your poets, writers and musicians follow a narrow line in their work? We do not understand why, for example, I can buy *Pravda* in New York, but my colleagues here cannot buy the *New York Times*. I repeat that this is all the more incomprehensible, considering your absolute faith in the future.

Khrushchov: Firstly, things in the U.S.A. are far from what you say. The progressive press in the U.S.A. is subject to various forms of repression. Secondly, if we speak of why Soviet people do not buy your papers, you know that people buy what they need. Our people feel no need to read American newspapers. I'm told that the number of subscribers to your papers in the Soviet Union is literally only a few score. This is understandable. Soviet people want to know the truth, they want to have good spiritual food, which helps them better to arrange their lives and understand world events more clearly. As for your papers, they print a lot of untruths and misinformation. Why should we force that on our readers?

We want our people to have good quality products, including newspapers and magazines, so that these newspapers and magazines should help people to understand the internal and international situation more clearly, and not mislead them.

As for Soviet writers and poets, evidently you understand their literary work quite incorrectly.

Reston: Do you consider that the situation in Poland has gone too far? Does this disturb you?

Khrushchov: Poland is a sovereign and independent state, with its own government, its own statesmen and political leaders, who have been empowered by the people to run the country, manage the work of socialist construction. We greet them and send them our good wishes. The Polish Government's struggle against certain persons who are trying to change the order established by the Polish people is a struggle to consolidate the democratic foundations of the country. This struggle has the support of the overwhelming majority of the Polish working people. Those who oppose this struggle are actually agents of the reactionary bourgeoisie and do not represent the interests of the Polish people. The Polish Government and the Polish United Workers' Party have the courage and skill to cope with the situation and ensure further successes in developing their socialist state. As for our sympathies, they are entirely on the side of the Polish people and the Polish United Workers' Party, which are building socialism in their country. We believe in the working people of Poland, who will not relinquish their socialist gains to anyone.

Reston: If Germany remains divided for a long time, will this not be something in the nature of an invitation for a new Hitler to urge the people that the country can be united only by force? Do you not think that the Soviet Union would gain more from the policy it has followed with respect to Finland and Austria than from that which it has followed in respect to Hungary and East Germany?

Khrushchov: I shall begin with an answer to the first of those questions. There can be no analogy here. As for the appearance, as you say, of a new Hitler, perhaps he has appeared already. Is there much difference between Hitler and Adenauer in their conceptions? Adenauer adheres to the same "positions of strength." It is just that perhaps he

has not yet fully mastered all the terminology that Hitler used. But even now former Hitler generals and other figures are very active in West Germany, while the Nazi general Speidel even holds a key post in NATO. So, as you see, a new Hitler may have already appeared and this, of course, is bound to arouse anxiety. But times have changed: Adenauer will not have the freedom of action that Hitler had. One-third of Germany is a socialist state. Among others, the people in West Germany have not forgotten the bloody lessons of history. The Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia are also not what they were. A third of humanity is now successfully building a socialist society. So you see, although we are disturbed by what is going on in West Germany, we believe that history will not repeat itself. Hitler in his day bragged that he would reach the Urals. If Adenauer now tries anything, little will be needed to stop him and not let him step even over his own borders.

The peace-loving peoples of Europe are disturbed by the policy of militarizing West Germany, they are disturbed by the fanning of revanchist feelings there. All this should be an even greater cause of anxiety to the French, the British, the Belgians, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Danes, and others, even though the governments in those countries are pursuing policies fostering the revival of German militarism. By joint efforts we would like to curb these trends in West Germany. We have worked for this, and will continue to do so, but the militarist forces in Western countries, and, especially, in the United States, are, on the contrary, encouraging the development of these trends and of militarist forces in West Germany. This disturbs us, but does not frighten us, because we are strong enough to crush the aggressive forces, should they attempt any new adventures. German militarism and revanchism are opposed by all the peace-loving peoples, including the progressive forces of the German people themselves. We feel

certain that the American people are not interested in reviving German militarism either.

As for the policy of the Soviet Union with respect to such capitalist countries as Finland and Austria, or to such socialist states as the German Democratic Republic and Hungary, I would advise you to address your question to the leaders of these countries. They will probably be able to answer it better.

Reston: Communist organs of the press all over the world are speaking a great deal about what is called the "lesson of Hungary." What is this? In asking the questions about the Soviet Union's policy with respect to the aforementioned four countries, I was not referring to the internal affairs of these countries but to the Soviet Government's policy towards them. On the one hand, with respect to Finland and Austria, we see a reasonable policy, which is of positive significance both to these two countries and the Soviet Union itself. As for East Germany and Hungary, here the Soviet Union acts quite differently.

Khrushchov: There is nothing surprising in the fact that the Soviet Union bases its relations with the German Democratic Republic, with Hungary or any other socialist state otherwise than with Finland, Austria or any other capitalist state. All the socialist countries are linked together by their common interests and objectives, by fraternal socialist solidarity. Always and in everything they fraternally help each other and are always ready to come to each other's aid. In response to the Hungarian Government's appeal, we were not daunted even by sacrifices and helped the working class and the toiling peasantry of Hungary to defeat counter-revolution and defend the socialist gains of the people from encroachment by imperialist reaction, when the enemies of socialism attempted to take all these gains away from the working people of Hungary. And today we are happy to see Hungary progressing normally, and the free and independent socialist state of the Hungarian working people gaining strength.

We were glad that when a conflict, engineered from outside, broke out in East Germany, it did not come to serious clashes there. But had we been asked, we would not have refused to come to the aid of the working class and of all the working people of the German Democratic Republic because we are always ready to give timely help to a fraternal socialist state.

Reston: What developments have taken place in the relations between Washington and Moscow since the meeting of President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchov at the Geneva Conference?

Khrushchov: After the Geneva Four-Power Heads-of-Government Conference in 1955, there was a clear tendency towards lesser international tension. The ideas of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems penetrated deeply into the minds of the peoples. This is quite understandable. The peoples do not want to live under international tension, pregnant with the potential threat of the outbreak of a new war. The governments of various states, and the governments of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. above all, should have done everything to promote the further development of this tendency, and prevent regression to the worst days of the cold war.

As for the Soviet Union, our country moved step by step in this direction, seeking to strengthen the belief of the peoples in the possibility of maintaining universal peace and collective security. The visits of the leaders of the Soviet state to other countries, the visits of many delegations representing parliaments, governments and public organizations of various countries to the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government's clear-cut constructive proposals for disarmament, relaxation of international tension and the banishment of the threat of another war, the Soviet Union's concrete steps to develop world trade, scientific and cultural links and tourism, and many other things—all aimed at strengthening confidence among states, promoting relations

of friendship and cooperation among them, and forging stronger peace and security for all nations without exception

What was the response of the Western powers to these constructive, peace-loving actions of the Soviet Union? Unfortunately they concentrated on undermining the "Geneva spirit," on preventing the further relaxation of international tension. To prove this, I will indicate that already in December 1955, just some months after the Geneva Conference, the session of the NATO council officially announced its policy of using atomic and hydrogen weapons as the basic type of weapon to equip the troops of the Atlantic-bloc countries. Subsequently the Western powers continued in this direction the United States began to station its own special atomic task forces in foreign territories, Britain was promised deliveries of American rocket weapons, and there began the practical implementation of plans to arm West Germany with nuclear and thermonuclear weapons

There is a good case for asserting that after Geneva, peace and the easing of international tension depended, in fact, wholly on the Western powers, particularly on the U.S.A., Britain and France. But it is actually due to the tender mercies of these powers that in the past two years mankind has repeatedly been faced with the threat of a universal war. France's war in Algeria, the inhuman Anglo-Franco-Israeli assault on Egypt, the preparation and unleashing of the counter-revolutionary insurrection in Hungary, Britain's armed actions in the Yemen and Oman, the announcement by the United States of the so-called "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine" which has become a screen for direct U.S. armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Near and Middle East countries, as was the case in Jordan, the political and military pressure brought to bear upon the independent state of Syria, and so on and so forth, are all aggressive actions for which not the Soviet Union is to blame.

Such are the facts and these facts cannot be evaded.

Nor have we the right to hush the fact that lately the world has again been overshadowed by the danger of a new war. We mean the campaign of provocations and threats, blackmail and intimidation against an independent state, the Syrian Republic

I would like, Mr. Reston, to tell you the following. If the aggressive forces are not curbed, very grave developments might start. You should know that upon the instructions of Mr. Dulles and other leaders in the American Government, Henderson recently visited the region of the Near and Middle East countries. Among others, he also visited Turkey. It is known what instructions Henderson carried out. He tried to get the Arab countries to attack Syria. But now that this has failed, now that Henderson and his chiefs have realized that the Arab peoples are opposed to war against Syria, the attention of the imperialists is concentrated on Turkey, which they would like to launch an aggressive attack on Syria. The Turkish Government has moved troops up to the Syrian frontier and is continuing to concentrate troops there.

American ruling circles are intensively pushing Turkey upon this dangerous path, demanding that Turkey crush the Government of Syria which is not to the United States' liking, that there be created in Syria a government which would be an obedient tool in the hands of the U.S.A., would pursue a policy of enslavement of the Arab countries by the U.S. imperialists and lead them into American bondage. Actually this would also be colonial slavery though in another form. The roost would be ruled not by the French or British, but by American imperialism which is no less cruel and merciless.

That is what the U.S. imperialists want, that is why Henderson was so energetic in this area.

This example once again convinces us that the imperialist forces are prepared to commit any crime, to say any lie just so as to achieve their predatory aims. Certain statesmen in the U.S.A. often begin and end their speeches by

appealing to the Lord, that He may bring the peoples peace and good graces. But publicly stating one thing, they act in another way. What blasphemy!

To blacken the Communists in the eyes of those people who are not well versed in political questions, many bourgeois leaders call them atheists. We Communists, being atheists, are guided by the most humane considerations in relations between human beings. We seek to make things ever better for people. A Communist considers it happiness for himself when he secures happiness for all people. But certain leading personalities in bourgeois countries, appealing to the Lord for help in their activities, are far from being always guided in their actions by good and humane motives.

It would be useful if the American Senate would acquaint itself with the directives which Henderson received from Dulles before his visit to the Near and Middle East countries. This would be beneficial for the consolidation of peace. As to what directives Dulles gave Henderson no small amount of information has already appeared in the press. There are after all no absolute secrets. Secrets are secret only up to a certain time and then they become known to an ever broadening group of people. What I have been telling you about finds its confirmation in those actions which are being undertaken by the American authorities in the region of the Near and Middle East.

As regards the consequences which the actions of Dulles and Henderson may have, I can say that it is easy to start a war but far more difficult to stop it. If Turkey starts hostilities against Syria this can have very grave consequences for Turkey as well. This spark can set off a great war conflagration.

We on our part are doing everything possible to ensure that the events should not lead to the unleashing of war. Naturally, we cannot remain passive as the Middle East is in direct proximity to the Soviet Union and Turkey is our neighbour and has a long common frontier with us. We would

like to warn the Turkish Government against hasty adventurist steps which can push it into the abyss of war out of which Turkey will find it difficult to escape.

The most warlike of the ruling circles of the U.S.A., on the contrary, are going all out to unleash war in this region and, of course, they are doing this not without agreement of similar circles in Britain and France. After all it is known that last year the governments of Britain, France and Israel started hostilities against Egypt also not without the knowledge of the Government of the U S A. True, the ruling circles of the U.S.A. pretended that they were ignorant of this But nobody in the world seriously believes in this ignorance.

It is now clear to everyone what the "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine" means, what filling the "vacuum" means. This means war against those who do not submit to the U.S. *diktat*.

We consider that a solemn renouncement by the Great Powers of the use of armed forces in the Near and Middle East could to a considerable degree contribute to the relaxation of tension in this region of the world.

We are against competition in arms which promises nothing good for peace. In this connection I want to say a few words about disarmament.

We have always considered this problem as one of the most important international problems on whose solution depends the course of development of the relations between states, whether along the path of peace or along the path of war. The Soviet Government considers it necessary to reach agreement without delay on a solution of the disarmament problem that would eliminate the danger of a new war and create conditions for promoting relations between states on the basis of peace and mutual understanding. Seeking to achieve its solution the Soviet Union has repeatedly taken the initiative and come out with broad, all-embracing proposals on these questions.

Unfortunately, up to now the Western powers are not manifesting a genuine desire to secure a solution of the disarmament problem and with regard to atomic and hydrogen weapons they declare openly that they do not consider their prohibition desirable. The Soviet Union is prepared at any moment to sign an agreement for the prohibition of these weapons, but our appeals, which are supported by the peace-loving peoples, find no response on the part of those powers which dominate the so-called Western world.

Agreement between our two countries and between all the Great Powers on the disarmament problem would be welcomed with the utmost satisfaction by ordinary people in all the corners of the globe and would open the door for broad cooperation between states, for lasting peaceful co-existence of all countries and peoples.

Reston. Speaking of those instructions which, as you said, Henderson received from Dulles, I would like to ask whether the Soviet Government knows the substance of these instructions and whether these instructions are really such as you have just characterized them to be.

Khrushchov: You better ask Mr. Dulles. In his speeches he often talks of God. Let him tell under oath what instructions he gave Henderson. If he really believes in God and does not want to commit perjury, he will admit that such were the instructions he gave.

Reston: If this is really so I am truly flabbergasted. I would like to mention the following fact. When Eisenhower was a young man and was entering West Point he did this against the wishes of his mother and father who were pacifists. Sending him off his mother said to him quoting from the Bible: "He who takes the sword shall perish with the sword." I firmly believe that more than anything in the world Eisenhower wants there to be no war. Not so long ago I spoke with someone in the United States Senate who knows Eisenhower better than anybody else. I asked him: What does Eisenhower want more than anything else? what does he want to achieve before 1961 when his

term of office as President ends? And this man answered that the only thing that Eisenhower wants is to achieve a peaceful agreement with the Soviet Union, beginning at least from an agreement on the problems of disarmament. I believe with all my heart that this is so and that is why I simply do not know how to react to your words.

Khrushchov. I agree with you that these are truly very serious things. But I assure you that this is so. The facts confirm this convincingly. The ruling circles of the U.S.A. are virtually pushing Turkey against Syria. Turkey is concentrating her forces at the Syrian frontier. She is even laying bare certain sections of her frontier with the Soviet Union. But she should certainly not be doing this.

If you really have somebody in the Senate who is close to Eisenhower, then why shouldn't you convey through him to President Eisenhower that he should implement his noble aspirations and, by exercising his authority, stay the criminal hand raised over the world and ready to plunge the world into a new slaughter? But then Eisenhower must know of all this because Dulles can do nothing without the President's consent. Possibly Mr. Eisenhower does sincerely want to come to an agreement with us, but in a number of cases he tries to deal with us as if we were his satellites who are ready to obey him in everything. But one cannot deal with us that way. It is necessary to take into account the interests of our country, the interests of peace.

Nowhere, in no region of the world, have we any special interests. We have no such interests in Egypt, in Syria and generally in the Arab countries and we want nothing from them. We have our own oil, grain, ore, and in far greater quantities than the Arab countries. Our policy with respect to these countries is based on non-interference in their internal affairs. As regards the U.S.A. it is putting into operation the "Dulles-Eisenhower" doctrine and inventing a vacuum. But it does not exist in a single corner of the world. Everywhere there are people occupied with their work and living a peaceful life.

What I am speaking of are unpleasant facts. But I am forced to talk about them and to condemn such actions. Of course, this will not be to the taste of Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eisenhower, but I cannot make deals with my conscience. It is a fact that Turkey is preparing war against Syria. And it is certain leading personalities in the U.S.A. who are pushing Turkey upon this dangerous path. The public should know of this. I hope you will understand us. The U.S.A. after all is far removed from this region whereas we neighbour on it. If guns start firing there it will be difficult to stop. And events can progress from machine-guns and cannons to rockets and that will lead to dire consequences.

Reston: I highly appreciate the sincerity with which you are talking to me, and I will give a full account of what you have said, but I am surprised at what you say about the events in Syria. I do not doubt that my country acted against her allies when they entered the Middle East region. This was not easy but the U.S.A. did this. In spite of what you have said on this question, I still consider that France and Britain deceived the United States last year and now we find ourselves in the same bog. You accuse us and we accuse you. And the most surprising thing is that for some reason we cannot negotiate directly with each other so as to come to some sort of an agreement.

Khrushchov: Please write down all that I am saying and convey it to your people. We want there to be no war. We believe that although we have different political beliefs we can achieve agreement on the question of maintaining peace. We are against war, we are for peaceful coexistence. But you will see what will happen when you publish this interview with me. Mud will be thrown at me, my words will be contested in an attempt to lull the people, to influence them. But if this helps to frustrate the war which is being prepared I will be glad.

The time will come when all documents will not be held in secret and will be published. Then the American public

will learn everything. You will remember my words and will become convinced of their truthfulness.

Reston: Does this mean that there were no Soviet provocations in Syria and that the Soviet Union did not supply arms to Syria?

Khrushchov: From the Soviet side there were no provocations in Syria. There is not a single Soviet soldier in Syria, there is but one economic delegation with a group of technical experts. There are no other Soviet citizens in Syria except the staff of the Embassy. We make no secret of the fact that we sold some arms to Syria for her self-defence. Don't you know that the U.S.A. has supplied and is continuing to supply arms to many countries?

Many Arabs, and I have in mind first and foremost the leaders of the Arab countries, are very remote from communist ideas. In Egypt, for instance, many Communists are held in prison. The leaders of the Arab countries are nationalists, they are against colonial slavery and they stand for the consolidation of their countries' political and economic independence. We do not conceal the fact that we sympathize with those peoples who are fighting for their independence and we are ready to help them in this struggle. In this we do not pursue any objectives but one—that the peoples be freed from colonial dependence. We know that communism cannot be indoctrinated by bayonets, that ideas cannot be got across with machine-guns. In tsarist Russia there was no freedom of assembly, of speech or of the press. But tsarism nonetheless was overthrown by the revolution because the ideas of Marxism-Leninism took hold of the masses.

Today the colonial system is disintegrating. The ruling circles of the U.S.A. are trying to stop this process and they are now playing the part of an international gendarme acting against the peoples who are struggling for freedom and independence. But they do not want to fight with their own hands, for this would be a too obvious interference. That is why the U.S.A. wants to use other countries. And

such shameful affairs are concealed under inventions about the "menace of communism." But is Nasser a Communist? Certainly not. But we support Nasser nevertheless. We do not want to turn him into a Communist and he does not want to turn us into nationalists. This is what coexistence, respect for national sovereignty and non-interference in each other's affairs are.

As regards the ways of settling the problems of the Middle and Near East, we recently sent letters to the U.S.A., Britain and France on this question. We want to find common ground so as to eliminate the threat of war in this area. At one time we proposed to conclude an agreement to reciprocally renounce the sale of arms to the countries of that area. The Western states, however, rejected this proposal.

We want to live in peace with all countries, we are always prepared for any meeting if there exists the desire to come to an agreement. We believe that such an agreement will be achieved. If the other side temporarily does not want this agreement, then one should have patience and wait.

Reston: In connection with the failure of the last negotiations after Geneva, is there in the opinion of Mr. Khrushchov any new hopeful field for negotiations between the two countries?

Khrushchov: Now it is clear to any reasonable man that in our days it is impossible to solve international issues by force of arms, that there is only one path, the path of peaceful negotiations taking into account the interests of all the participants of the negotiations on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. It is this path of solving international problems that is supported by the Soviet Union.

If all the states, and first and foremost the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., possessing the greatest military and economic might would, in a businesslike way, in a spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding, strive for discussion and a solution of the important international problems complicat-

ing the situation and hindering the establishment of firm confidence, then the chances for peace throughout the world and, I stress, for all countries and peoples, would grow considerably. Mankind longs for peace, and it is the duty of the governments of all states to meet this desire, to achieve truly peaceful cooperation of the peoples the world over.

Here I would like to say a few words about Soviet-American relations. The positions of our states can have a decisive influence on the international situation both towards making it more healthy and towards its aggravation. If the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A. and the other Great Powers want it, they can guarantee firm and lasting world peace for many years to come.

During the Second World War, the Soviet Union and the United States fought together against the aggressors. The question begs: That being so, why can't we prevent war now? We can and we must do that.

We have had repeated occasion to hear and read what the leaders of the American state say in calling for the preservation of peace. But in the U.S.A., we can often, too often, hear official persons who say things having nothing at all in common with peace. We Soviet people can't understand where then the official line of the American Government lies, whether it is reflected by what the first say or by what the second say. Nor can we understand why there is such a difference between what the leaders of the American Government say and how things actually develop. We can't understand why, when they talk of peace, they simultaneously spurn disarmament and a ban on atomic and hydrogen weapons, and also why decisions are taken to wage wars with these weapons. We can't understand why the network of military bases ringing other states is continually expanding, why a goodly proportion of the American armed forces are stationed in foreign territories, and why plans and doctrines making the world so feverish are set forth.

The Soviet people believe that the American leaders shaping the foreign policy of their country will ultimately recognize the need for peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union, and then the creative efforts of the American people will be directed to strengthening peace and security for all the nations.

For its part, the Soviet Union, true to its policy of peace, will continue to follow the course of easing international tension and of improving relations with all countries, above all with the United States, since our relations cannot be thought satisfactory at present. We persistently seek to improve relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. and to develop all-round cooperation and contacts between our countries, between the Soviet and the American peoples. Let us hope, for one thing, that the Soviet-American talks, beginning shortly, on developing contacts will be constructive. As far as the Soviet side is concerned, we will make every effort to ensure that these talks should pave the way to further, broader cooperation in all the spheres of life of our states.

Reston: I am sincerely grateful to you for having spent so much time on answering my questions. I would like to ask who has been authorized by the Soviet Union to conduct the forthcoming talks with the United States on mutual contacts. When you speak of broader cooperation between our states, have you in mind any concrete programme or the holding of technical discussions that would precede a new conference like the Geneva Conference or a top-level conference between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.?

Khrushchov: I may not be well versed in this subject, since I have been away on holiday. But as far as I know, the U.S.A. has made concrete proposals. We think the talks could take place on a broader basis, but for the time being they will be confined to a small range of questions. As to who will conduct the talks, there is no decision yet, but this will depend in the long run on the rank of the American representatives. We are ready to negotiate at any level

both on these and on all other problems, as long as it allows people to sleep without worry. It is not by chance that people in all languages, when retiring to bed, say: "Good night," and in the morning say: "Good morning." So let us bring about conditions for people to really sleep without worry.

The only thing we need to do is to recognize what is historically a fact, that is, recognize that the U.S.S.R. exists as a socialist state, that China exists as a socialist state, that all the other socialist states exist. It must be recognized that these states are developing in accordance with the will and wishes of their peoples, and there must be no interference in their affairs. We, for our part, proceed from the actual fact that capitalist countries such as the United States, Britain, France and others do exist and that their social structure is a domestic affair of their peoples.

We believe that all controversial problems must be settled by negotiation, without war. If for a time we can't reach agreement on some problems, we have to be patient and strive step by step to solve them. We think that if the United States displays a readiness, there are no questions upon which agreement could not be reached. To live without war on a basis of peaceful competition—such is the essence of coexistence. If you recognize this and base your policy on this instead of relying on some sort of internal forces of the socialist states, supposedly capable of altering the socialist system, it will be easy to reach agreement on all disputed issues.

I expressed a readiness to receive you, wishing to promote the achievement of better understanding between our states. I will be glad if our conversation contributes to this. If not, I will be disappointed.

When speaking of the extension of contacts between our countries, I would also like to mention the following fact. At one of his news conferences, President Eisenhower, in reply to a question from one of the correspondents about a possible meeting between Marshal Zhukov and the United

States Defence Secretary, said that he saw no grounds for saying that such a meeting would not be useful. We believed what President Eisenhower said. With an eye to the position held by Mr. Eisenhower and Marshal Zhukov and regarding the President's words as expressing a wish to improve relations between our countries, we thought Marshal Zhukov could go to the United States. With this purpose our Ambassador in the United States was instructed to call on Mr. Dulles and find out how the President's statement was to be understood. Dulles told our Ambassador that Eisenhower's words had simply been misunderstood in the Soviet Union and that President Eisenhower had not implied any concrete proposals. This produced a very unfavourable impression in the Soviet Union. We take pride in our state and our people, and we are not soliciting invitations anywhere. Naturally, we are not pleased when a desire is expressed for a meeting, and the door is then shut. Responsible statesmen should honour their pledges.

Reston: I remember Eisenhower's words well—I was at that news conference. We in the United States were surprised that the Soviet Union did nothing after these words.

Khrushchov: Yes, I read in the American papers that we had, supposedly, not replied. But this is not true. The State Department simply concealed from the American people that we had inquired into this matter. I'm prepared to furnish you with the necessary reference material, from which the attitude of the State Department will be clear. By doing this I shall perhaps be committing a breach of diplomatic etiquette, but I don't mind all that as long as it serves the cause of peace.

Reston: We shall be very thankful for such material and will use it in our paper.

J. Reston thanked N. S. Khrushchov for the interview.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
PUT BY P. DAMPSON,
CORRESPONDENT
OF THE TORONTO *TELEGRAM***

The correspondent of the Toronto *Telegram*, P. Dampson, recently submitted a number of questions dealing with international problems and also with Soviet-Canadian relations to N. S. Khrushchov.

We here publish the latter's answers together with the questions.

Question: Are you in favour of a wider exchange of visits between the Soviet Union and the West?

Would you, Mr. Khrushchov, in the interests of world peace and for the further strengthening of Soviet-Canadian friendship, agree to an exchange of visits between yourself and the new Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker?

Answer. We attach great importance to the development of economic, political and cultural ties between all countries, and also to the maintenance of personal contacts between the leaders of different countries.

In our opinion, such ties and contacts, which include the exchange of visits, contribute to the growth of confidence between peoples and hence improve the international situation and strengthen peace. We are always in favour of exchanges of visits by statesmen, if such visits are well prepared and can contribute to the improvement of mutual understanding.

Question. What, in your view, is preferable to continue discussing universal disarmament in the general bodies of the United Nations, or to reconvene the UN Sub-Committee, whose five member-countries include Canada and the Soviet Union, in order that it should once again try to solve this problem? What is your estimation of the latest disarmament negotiations in the Sub-Committee?

Answer. The problem of disarmament, especially that of the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the cessation of tests of these weapons, is one which affects the interests of all mankind, and it is therefore not surprising that the attention of all the peoples of the world is focused upon it.

In reply to your question, it should be said that it is most desirable that negotiations should take place where they will be of the greatest benefit to the cause of disarmament.

As you know, the Soviet Union supports disarmament, the reduction of armed forces and armaments and the withdrawal of troops belonging both to the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to the parties to the Warsaw Treaty from the territories of other countries. The Soviet Union calls for the banning of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the immediate cessation of tests of these weapons with the establishment of international control.

All these problems cannot, of course, be solved at once. They should be approached step by step, beginning with those whose solution would be acceptable to the interested parties. Such an approach would facilitate the relaxation of international tension and create an atmosphere of greater confidence between countries. After the first favourable results, it would be possible to go further and to find an acceptable solution to other problems linked with the disarmament issue.

I want to emphasize that we do not deny the need for the establishment of control over the fulfilment of any agreement reached, but we suggest that a start be made not with

control but with concrete steps towards disarmament, since first of all it is surely necessary to know what to control. It is necessary to stop the arms race and to begin the reduction of armed forces and armaments. Then we shall go further, gradually introducing control, and at some stage there will apparently be no obstacles to the establishment of the most extensive international control.

Let us now turn to the work of the Sub-Committee of the UN Disarmament Commission.

Speaking frankly, the negotiations in this Sub-Committee amount to marking time. The representatives of the Western powers have tried and are trying to show that a private discussion of disarmament problems within the restricted circle of countries represented on the Sub-Committee is producing good results. But the private discussion of these problems cannot facilitate their successful solution. The present restricted composition of the Sub-Committee does not provide any opportunity for many countries which have an interest in the achievement of international agreement on disarmament to take part in the discussion of this important question.

What is the composition of the Sub-Committee? It includes, on the one hand, the Soviet Union and, on the other, members of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc headed by the U.S.A. The Western representatives are making every effort to find formulas and proposals which would to some extent whitewash their countries in the eyes of the public, while not being acceptable to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which are sincerely in favour of disarmament.

Such a casuistical approach to disarmament negotiations on the part of the Western powers aims at lulling public vigilance and at blocking any agreement.

The whole course of the negotiations in the Sub-Committee and also many other facts demonstrate that the Western countries are afraid of disarmament. They fear disarmament because their governments (above all in the

U.S.A.) are dependent upon monopoly groups who do not want to reorganize their economy in order to manufacture the civilian goods because they are deriving immense profits from the manufacture of armaments. In order to ensure the continuance of such profits in the future, they use every means to keep the cold war at a certain height, increase international tension and intimidate people with the "communist menace." The monopolists hope in this way to continue to extract large sums from the population in the form of high taxation and maintain a favourable economic situation enabling them to obtain high profits.

We consider that the work of the Disarmament Sub-Committee serves no useful purpose and is absolutely fruitless. New organizational forms must be found for the more effective settlement of the disarmament problem. In our opinion such a form could, for example, be the setting-up of a Standing Commission on Disarmament consisting of all the UN member-countries. It is perfectly clear that disarmament negotiations should be conducted in full public view, and not, as has hitherto been the case in the Sub-Committee, in a manner which created only a semblance of work being done to achieve disarmament, while in fact vitally important issues were in no way being solved.

Question: Does the Soviet Union consider that the winding-up of foreign military bases in all European countries would be an effective contribution to the relaxation of international tension?

Answer: Yes, undoubtedly. The winding-up of military bases abroad is one of the most important issues in solving the problem of disarmament and the relaxation of international tension. It would be most reasonable to begin precisely with this. Judge for yourself—can the peace-loving peoples believe in the sincerity of declarations about disarmament made by statesmen of countries which maintain military bases in foreign countries?

If the Western powers had really wanted to solve the disarmament problem and to achieve a relaxation of international tension they should have wound up their military bases abroad and withdrawn their armed forces. It would also be logical to reduce armed forces by an amount at least equivalent to the number of troops at present manning these bases. The whole world is aware that the overwhelming majority of the military bases are to be found close to the frontiers of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the peace-loving countries of Europe, Asia and Africa. If the United States of America and the other Western countries were to wind up their bases, then the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving countries would immediately carry out measures for further disarmament. All this would facilitate the strengthening of peace and the abolition of international tension.

Furthermore, it should be said frankly that the time is not far distant when all will be obliged to acknowledge that military bases abroad no longer have the importance ascribed to them by some immoderately boastful generals and other aggressively inclined Western statesmen. It is necessary to take sober and realistic account of the development of present-day technology, as a result of which the situation has changed radically. The production of intercontinental ballistic missiles has solved the problem of delivering a thermonuclear warhead to any point on the globe. Distance is now no obstacle. As for the military bases in Europe, Africa and Asia, missiles which can reach any part of these continents have already been in existence for a long time. I think that it is no secret that there now exists a range of missiles with the aid of which it is possible to fulfil any assignment of operational and strategic importance. Nor, of course, is it any secret that such missiles now have both atomic and hydrogen warheads. Let us not play hide-and-seek with the facts; let us look them in the face. Can it be supposed that military bases are known only to those who established them? But if their

location is known, then, given the present level of missile and other technology, they can speedily be rendered ineffective.

We are convinced that very soon the peoples of those countries in which American military bases have been set up many thousands of kilometres from America herself, will come to realize more fully what a terrible danger these bases constitute for their countries and will resolutely demand the immediate abolition of foreign bases on their territory.

Question: Are you ready to agree that the Soviet Union stop testing nuclear weapons until such time as the disarmament problem is in some way solved, on condition the Western countries do the same?

Answer: The Soviet Government is ready at any time to sign an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests, as soon as the Western powers agree to assume a similar commitment. Today the development of science has reached such a level that it is possible to control the fulfilment of obligations undertaken. But if other countries believe that some additional control on the territory of countries which conduct tests is necessary, we are also ready to consider terms for the introduction of such control.

We have submitted proposals on this question, and our attitude remains unchanged. The delay in finding a solution to the problem of halting nuclear weapon tests is not the fault of the Soviet Union; the responsibility is that of the U.S.A. and Britain, who obstinately refuse to agree on this question. We believe that in the interests of mankind it is necessary to get nuclear weapon tests stopped. If the public opinion in all countries and all peace-loving peoples play an active part and raise their voices, there can be no doubt that the tests will be stopped.

Question: Is the Soviet Union satisfied with the situation in the Middle East? If not, what proposals can Russia make to help improve the atmosphere in the area?

Answer. The question is somewhat strange neither the Soviet Union nor any peace-loving country can be satisfied with the situation in any part of the world, if there is an impending threat of armed conflict which can develop into a third world war with the employment of atomic and hydrogen weapons

We are very distressed and concerned about what is taking place in the Middle East. The Arab countries have only recently won freedom from colonial oppression, but they have not yet won freedom from economic dependence. They are at present fighting to consolidate their independence. The Arab countries want to develop their industries and agriculture and to improve the living and cultural standards of their peoples. This is a completely logical process, expressing the aspirations of the peoples. But the imperialists do not want the Arab peoples to have political and economic independence. They consider that if it is no longer possible to apply the old techniques and methods of colonialization in order to keep the peoples in subjection, then it is necessary to assert their supremacy in these countries by other means—by bribery and the imposition of bought governments which would pursue a policy advantageous to the colonialists and help them to carry out their policy of economic enslavement. If the peoples and governments of these countries oppose this and resist any form of political and economic enslavement, then the imperialists declare that a “menace of communism” exists there, make use of the communist bogey and begin to organize attacks along the same lines as in Guatemala. This is the method being used by the U.S.A. in preparing an attack against Syria through Turkey.

What has Syria done, why has she aroused such hatred on the part of imperialist circles in the U.S.A.? Her people and Government want complete political and economic independence; they want to act as the national interests of their country prompt them. But this angers the imperialists, who want to make Syria their colony once more. Therefore,

the reason for the tense situation in the Middle East is the interference of the Western powers, and above all of the U.S.A., in the internal affairs of the Arab countries

Syria called upon the United Nations to consider the threat of aggression against her. The Soviet Union in its official statements gave repeated warnings of the serious threat which had matured in the Middle East. The Soviet Government's proposals on this matter are contained in the speeches of the Soviet representatives to the UN General Assembly, where Syria's complaint is currently being discussed. We hope that UNO will pay heed to the voice of the peace-loving peoples and take steps to influence the aggressive countries, including Turkey, who is being urged to take action against Syria. To carry out the "Syrian operation" the U.S.A. has supplied Turkey with all the necessary arms—tanks, planes, artillery and vehicles, while the Turks are to supply the soldiers for this bloody and dangerous adventure

The peace-loving peoples must snatch away the match which the imperialists have brought close to the powder barrel. This would be to the interest not only of Syria and the other Arab countries, but also of the peoples of the U.S.A. and other countries, especially Turkey. All the peoples of the world who want to live in peace and who oppose war have an interest in this.

Question Does Russia favour German reunification? If so, what proposals is Russia prepared to make in an attempt to bring this about?

Answer: We were and are in favour of German reunification. But the facts of the situation must be taken into account in solving this problem. There are in Germany two states, each with a different social and political system.

There is the German Federal Republic, which is pursuing a policy of militarization. There, the Hitler techniques are being vigorously applied and democratic freedoms suppressed, while the Communist Party is banned. That, it will be recalled, is how Hitler began. If the aggressive ele-

ments in West Germany are not checked, moves will follow which will lead to the prohibition of the Social-Democratic Party and other organizations and to the suppression of all the peace-loving social forces in West Germany.

There is the German Democratic Republic, which consistently adheres to a policy of peace and friendship. In the Democratic Republic all the main means of production are socially owned, while the workers have come to enjoy every democratic freedom and are confidently building socialism.

Without acknowledging the fact of the existence of these two states it is impossible to advance a single step towards the reunification of Germany. We support unification, but such unification must be based on agreement between the two German states. Can the German Democratic Republic and the German Federal Republic now reach agreement? That question I cannot answer. Only the Germans themselves, that is, the two German states, can advance the solution of this problem by entering into negotiations with each other. It is common knowledge that the Government of the German Democratic Republic has expressed its readiness to meet the Bonn Government, but the Adenauer Government has rejected such a meeting.

It would, of course, be naïve to suppose that if such a meeting takes place agreement on reunification will be easy and immediate. The Government of the German Federal Republic will not agree to abolish the capitalist system which exists in West Germany. But that Government cannot expect that the Government and people of the Democratic Republic will agree to the abolition of the substantial social gains won by the workers in East Germany. But there are all-German issues on which it would be possible to agree. The Government of the German Democratic Republic, taking this into account and expressing the desire of all Germans for the reunification of their native land, has proposed the establishment of a German Confederation, within the framework of which the two sovereign states would pursue a common policy on particular issues, with

due regard for their differing social systems. To ignore the fact of the existence of two German states and to attempt to solve the problem of German reunification without their participation, means taking the path of force, which will lead to a military catastrophe capable of turning into a new world war. Therefore the problem of German reunification must be solved peacefully, and that means recognizing the existence of two German states with differing social systems and gradually finding elements common to both. Given the situation which has arisen, it is difficult to conceive of any other solution.

Question: Do you personally consider that the danger of war is less than, for example, a year or two ago?

Answer: At first sight a concrete question, this is at the same time an enigma. It is very difficult to give a short answer. From the point of view of common sense, there now exist conditions which are not fraught with the danger of war in the near future. We can say that the peoples are anxious for peace, that we do not have an eve-of-war situation like that, for example, prior to the Second World War. Then the aggressive actions of Hitler Germany went unpunished and the aggressors were encouraged in their attacks upon peace-loving countries. There are today imperialist, militarist groups who would like to unleash war, but the peoples do not support their aggressive aspirations and are fighting back. And furthermore, great changes have taken place in the countries against which the imperialists would like to launch war, and therefore an attack upon them would be fraught with serious danger for the assailant.

The imperialist monopolies have a vested interest in profits and war is a most profitable undertaking for them. But the people, of course, have no interest in war.

The socialist countries which express the will of the people, the working class, the working peasants and intellectuals, have no interest in war. The governments of these countries are doing everything to ensure not only that there

shall be no war, but also that the state of tension shall be abolished and normal conditions for competition between the two systems on the basis of peaceful coexistence created.

We deny that war is inevitable. But it is also impossible categorically to declare that there will be no war. In some capitalist countries there are people in high governmental posts who are calling for war. Can anyone say what madmen will do?

Last year, there was no ground for war in Egypt. The Government of Egypt had exercised its legal rights by nationalizing the Suez Canal Company. But this legitimate act was so "daring" that Britain, France and Israel, not, of course, without the approval of other powerful countries upon whom British and French policy is orientated, started a war against Egypt. How did it end? It ended in the complete collapse of the aggressors' plans. As a result the economies of Britain and France were seriously undermined, while their military prestige and governments were discredited in the eyes of all progressive mankind.

Now a new conflict which can lead to war has ripened in the Middle East. If the peoples of all countries stand on guard for peace, if they do not allow themselves to be lulled, if they are watchful and raise their voices in time, the aggressors will not succeed in launching a new war and peace will be preserved.

Question. Is the Soviet Union satisfied with the trade agreement concluded between Canada and Russia at the beginning of 1956? Has Russia any concrete proposals for the extension of trade between our two countries?

Answer: The Soviet Government greeted with satisfaction the conclusion in February 1956 of a trade agreement between the U.S.S.R. and Canada based on most favoured nation treatment.

However, despite the favourable prospects for the expansion of mutually advantageous trade which opened up as a result of the signing of this agreement, trade between the

two countries has still not developed sufficiently. It should be especially emphasized that Canada's maintenance of discriminatory restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union in the form of lists of so-called strategic commodities is a serious hindrance to its expansion.

Trade between the U.S.S.R. and Canada remains predominantly one-sided in character and is virtually confined to the purchase by Soviet foreign trade organizations of Canadian wheat for the Far Eastern regions. At the same time Canadian purchases of Soviet commodities are on a very restricted scale, possibly to some extent because Canadian firms are insufficiently acquainted with the Soviet market.

We hope that the forthcoming visit to Canada by a delegation of representatives of Soviet foreign trade organizations will have a favourable influence upon Soviet-Canadian trade to the advantage of both countries.

International Affairs, No. 11, 1957

**INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE
OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION.
THE GROWTH OF THE FORCES
OF WORLD SOCIALISM**

*From the Report "Forty Years of the Great October
Socialist Revolution" to the Jubilee Session of the
Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.
November 6, 1957*

Comrades,

The forty years under review are unmatched in world history in terms of events of the greatest significance, in terms of the radical social and economic changes that have taken place in the lives of many nations. They have seen the victorious march of the forces of democracy and socialism and the liberation of many countries and peoples from the shackles of colonialism and imperialism. The victory of the October Revolution gave rise to a powerful revolutionary liberation movement that swept the globe.

At that time international reaction succeeded in stamping out the flames of revolution in a number of Western countries and putting off for a while the collapse of the colonial system. But reaction was powerless to destroy the seeds sown by the Soviet revolution, for nothing could halt the victorious march of the ideas of the Great October Revolution.

The forty years were a period in which the world communist and working-class movement showed an impetuous growth in breadth and depth. Strong Marxist-Leninist parties came into being, grew and became tempered in the course of revolutionary struggles; they now unite upwards of 33 million members.

In stressing the international significance of the experience of the October Revolution Lenin said that that experience had "gone on record as an achievement of socialism" and that "the future international revolution will raise its socialist edifice on that experience" (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 27, p. 377.) The course of events has fully borne out this prediction of Lenin's.

As a result of people's democratic revolutions that took place during and shortly after the Second World War a number of socialist states arose in Europe and Asia, and have been successfully developing ever since. The greatest event in history after the Great October Revolution was the victory of the revolution in China, followed by the establishment of the Chinese People's Republic. (*Prolonged applause.*) The path of socialist construction is also being followed by Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. In raising the edifice of socialism the working people of those countries have been using the experience of the October Revolution. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The rise of the world socialist system is a great gain of the international communist and working-class movement, a triumph of Marxism-Leninism. This great victory is the result of the heroic efforts of the working class and the working peasantry, a result of the revolutionary struggle of the Communist and Workers' parties, of their skill in creatively applying the Marxist-Leninist teaching to the specific conditions of their countries.

The world socialist camp today is an immense and steadily growing force. It accounts for more than 37 per cent of the world's coal output, about one-quarter of its iron and steel and about one-third of its cotton output. The socialist countries' share amounts to roughly one-third of the world's industrial output.

There are now two world systems—the socialist and the capitalist—each having its own specific laws of development.

Lenin says that uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Proportional economic development is impossible under capitalism with its anarchy of production, crises, bitter competition between the monopolies and the capitalist states. Force is the dominant principle of capitalism. Hence the tendency to deal with contradictions by means of threats, *diktat*, war and the seizure of foreign territory, sources of raw materials and markets. The fact that some of the capitalist countries have outstripped the others is due solely to the plundering of millions of toilers by a handful of capitalist monopolies and to ruthless exploitation of the dependent and semi-dependent countries. The United States has emerged to the forefront of the imperialist states, and West Germany is now out to do the same by elbowing and jostling Britain, France and other capitalist countries out of its way. Such is the law of capitalism—the strong beats the weak and the cash nexus holds sway.

The relations existing between the countries of the world socialist system are entirely different. The law which operates in this system is that of planned economic development. The economic progress of socialist society, a society which aims at the maximum satisfaction of the growing requirements of the people, is distinguished by a rapid growth of the productive forces and of the national wealth. All the socialist countries, big and small, those that have gone a long way to socialism as well as those that took the socialist path only recently, are completely equal. None lays claim to any advantages or privileges whatsoever. The experience acquired by one is made available to another, and the achievements of each go to strengthen not only that country but the socialist camp as a whole.

The Soviet Union is the first to have built socialism. It has acquired ample experience which it shares with all the fraternal countries, helping them build the new life. The

other socialist countries, which also have great and valuable experience in various spheres of economic and cultural development, for their part readily share that experience with, and help, the Soviet Union.

The victory of the people's system, fraternal mutual aid and consistent implementation of the policy of socialist industrialization enabled many peoples to get rid of the economic backwardness inherited from capitalism. The tremendous achievements of the socialist countries are a source of joy to the Soviet people and to all friends of socialism. Since its rise the Chinese People's Republic has increased industrial production nearly sixfold. And the day is not far off when people's China will become a mighty industrial power. (*Applause.*) Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Rumania, Yugoslavia and Albania have likewise registered major achievements in industrial development.

The progress made by the socialist countries in reconstructing agriculture along socialist lines is likewise worthy of note. Following the path outlined by Lenin, the Soviet Union has transformed its agriculture on socialist principles. Today the Chinese People's Republic is successfully carrying out a similar task and has already completed the association of its peasants in cooperatives. In Bulgaria the socialist sector in agriculture accounts for 87 per cent of the cultivated land, in Czechoslovakia for 60 per cent of the land area, and in Rumania for more than 42 per cent of all the farmland. Socialist reconstruction of agriculture is also under way in the other People's Democracies.

A high rate of economic development is typical of the socialist countries, which in 1956 increased industrial output more than fourfold compared with 1937. Now that the world socialist system has a solid industrial basis the socialist countries can proceed with the rapid development of their economies and steady improvement of the standard of living of the working people.

What is the basis of the unity of the countries of the great socialist commonwealth?

The basis on which this fraternal community is developing consists of the common principles of the political and social system, the oneness of Marxist-Leninist ideology, proletarian internationalism, the unity of the great aims of socialist construction, equality and mutual aid, defence of national independence and of the revolutionary gains in each country and throughout the world system of socialism, and protection of the peace and security of the nations. (*Applause.*)

The Marxist-Leninist Communist and Workers' parties are the guiding force of the socialist countries. The entire course of development raises before the revolutionary parties of the working class the prime task of fighting for greater unity and expanding the forms of cooperation on Marxist-Leninist principles. In keeping with the principles of socialist internationalism the Communist and Workers' parties are consolidating their ranks and combating revisionist tendencies and the harmful prejudices of national limitation and aloofness.

The imperialists, adhering to their hoary principle of "divide and rule," seize upon nationalist prejudices in their struggle against the socialist camp, and resort to ideological sabotage in the guise of so-called national communism. The ideologists of imperialism and their agents seek to sow the poisonous seeds of chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism in order to oppose one socialist country to the others.

Some who style themselves Communists and who have fallen for this propagandistic bait advocate socialism without the dictatorship of the proletariat, without guidance of social life by the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, without proletarian internationalism. Our opponents call this policy "liberal communism," thereby betraying their secret desire to turn the Communists into run-of-the-mill bourgeois liberals. Whither modern revision-

ism leads can be seen from the example of Djilas or Imre Nagy, who descended to outright betrayal of the cause of socialism and the basic national interests of their countries. The political and ideological defeat suffered by these enemies of socialism in Yugoslavia and Hungary will benefit socialism in those countries and the socialist system as a whole.

Another weapon of the present-day revisionists is the lauding of bourgeois democracy. This is an old weapon, borrowed from the opportunists of the Second International. There was a time when the renegade Kautsky and the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries wielded the same weapon in their bitter struggle against Lenin and the young Soviet Republic. The "wise men" in the leadership of the Right-Wing Socialists, as well as the latter-day revisionists, reason more or less along these lines: If the Communists in the countries where they are in power were to permit political activity against the socialist system we would admit that they have freedom, and would praise them.

But the revisionists will never get the chance to praise the Communists for anything of the kind. We proceed from the Leninist standpoint of developing and consolidating the socialist state, of developing socialist, not bourgeois, democracy, and we will not abandon this Leninist stand. (*Stormy applause*)

The international experience of building a socialist state in the transition period, in particular the lesson to be learned from the struggle against the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary, shows that the working class must be able to defend its power against internal and external enemies, that a working people's state must direct socialist construction and promote socialist democracy.

Modern conditions have given rise to various forms of the socialist state. At the same time it should be stressed that without a Marxist-Leninist party a socialist state cannot exist, the working class cannot be organized as the leading force of society, the indestructible alliance of the

working class and the peasantry cannot be ensured, and the tasks of socialist construction cannot be successfully carried out.

Lenin pointed out that all peoples and countries would come to socialism but not all in the same way, for each country would lend its own distinctive features to this or that form of democracy, to this or that variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat and, lastly, to the rate of socialist changes in the various aspects of social life. The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union emphasized that the experience of the countries which had taken the path of socialism had fully confirmed this proposition of Lenin's

Some people try to make use of this proposition and the decisions of the Twentieth Party Congress concerning the different forms of transition to socialism and methods of socialist construction. They interpret this proposition in their own fashion, saying that since Lenin put forward, and the Twentieth Congress confirmed and elaborated, this proposition on the different forms and methods of socialist construction, there is no need for the unity of the socialist countries. The exponents of this viewpoint assert that each country can advance to socialism in an entirely different way, distinct altogether from that of the other socialist countries.

The theory of scientific socialism takes, and must take, into consideration the peculiarities of each country that determine, to some degree or other, the forms and methods of socialist construction. That is understandable. No one who really stands on a revolutionary position will admit for a moment that in building socialism one can ignore the social, economic and historical peculiarities of the various countries. If one is to keep to the Marxist-Leninist view one should put the emphasis not on this or that peculiarity, since each country has its peculiarities, but on what is most important, that which is common to and underlies the struggle for socialism.

Differences in the practice of socialist construction may manifest themselves, for example, in establishing this or that form of industrial management, this or that method of cooperation in agriculture, but the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the association of the peasantry in cooperatives constitute that common element without which the socialist system cannot develop successfully. We know that the problems of industrial management in the Chinese People's Republic are tackled with due regard to the specific conditions of that country, that is, not in the same way as in the Soviet Union or, say, in Czechoslovakia. Nevertheless, while there is a variety of concrete forms of management, the main thing, namely, consistent implementation of the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist construction, fully retains its validity.

Socialism has acquired such prestige among the working people and the ideas of socialism have gripped the masses to such an extent that today the more far-sighted enemies of socialism and adherents of capitalism are willing to put up with the term "socialism," except that they insist on using an adjective and saying "national socialism" or "national communism."

Our class enemies find it hard to combat the united and firmly cemented front of the socialist countries. They hope to settle with the socialist countries singly so as to weaken the entire world system of socialism.

The enemies of socialism would like the Communists to start looking for entirely "new," artificial ways to socialism for each country in particular, disregarding the vast experience of socialist construction acquired by the Soviet Union, China and other countries. They suggest advancing to socialism singly, going pell-mell, so to speak, along different paths. If this view were adopted, then there would probably be so many "paths" that people would lose their way as in a forest and would be unable to reach their great goal. However, these calculations are doomed to failure. The Communist and Workers' parties have seen through the designs of

the enemies of socialism and are administering them a determined rebuff; they firmly adhere to Marxist-Leninist positions and will not let anybody lead them astray. Attempts to undermine the socialist movement from within, to weaken the socialist countries and parties and turn them against each other are one of the more refined forms of the struggle of imperialism and its agents against the world socialist system. This is one of the greatest perils, and we must fight hard against it.

The highroad to socialism has already been blazed and the basic forms and methods of socialist construction tried and tested by reality, by the experience of numerous socialist countries. It is necessary to improve these forms and methods, to assimilate and generalize the vast experience accumulated, the experience of the creative endeavour of the masses, tirelessly to extend it in keeping with the conditions of each country and people, to consolidate and not shake the camp of socialism, and then socialist society will steadily develop and grow, overcoming all obstacles and difficulties.

Attacking the socialist countries and their unity the imperialists and their agents spearhead their efforts against the Soviet Union. They do so because the U.S.S.R. is the most powerful socialist state. The influence which its example exerts on the international communist and working-class movement and on the colonial peoples fighting for national and social emancipation is very great. The imperialists fear the strength and might of the Soviet land, fear the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. That is why they are doing their utmost to discredit the experience of the Soviet Union and, consequently, the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

And that is why the revolutionary parties, all revolutionaries standing on class, Marxist-Leninist positions, consider it their sacred duty to promote international ties, to fully support the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries, and to cement the unity of the socialist countries, of all the revolutionary forces.
(*Applause.*)

Comrades, socialism exerts a tremendous, continuously growing influence on the course of world history, changing the face of the earth. Reality bears out the great Marxist truth which says that socialism makes rapid social progress possible. What can modern capitalism counter to that? Between 1937 and 1956, a period in which the socialist countries increased their production more than fourfold, the capitalist world could do no more than double its production despite all the measures to "prime" the economic situation, including a reckless arms race. But that is not all.

The general crisis of capitalism is becoming more acute, and the antagonisms rending the capitalist world are deepening. The struggle between the different capitalist countries and inside each of them, between labour and capital, is taking new forms. The general crisis of capitalism also finds expression in chronic unemployment, undercapacity working of industries, overproduction and crisis-like phenomena that occur in a number of capitalist countries from time to time. In the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism the enormous expansion of militarism, that cancerous growth of modern capitalist society, is a typical feature of aggressive imperialist policy and economy.

The capitalist system, doomed by history, is no longer able to proclaim aims capable of rousing and inspiring millions of people. Seeking to prolong its existence, the capitalists resort to the most refined forms of camouflage and deception, such as the false phrases of "people's capitalism," "democratic capital," "universal prosperity" in the bourgeois state, and so on. But neither the cheap propaganda tricks used by the champions of capitalism, nor even the imperialists' attempts to check the growth of socialism by force, can halt progress.

The reformists, who extol modern capitalism, laud to the heavens the social legislation enacted in some capitalist countries during the last forty years. However, they conceal the most important fact, namely, that although the capitalists have made some concessions those concessions

are a result of the tenacious struggle waged by the working class. The achievements of the socialist countries inspire the working people in the capitalist countries to fight against the exploiters and at the same time compel the bourgeoisie, which is bent on maintaining its rule, to make social and economic concessions. This reminds one of what the well-known American author, Theodore Dreiser, said about the social legislation enacted in the United States in the thirties. "For all this I thank Marx and Red Russia."

There is increasing exploitation in the imperialist countries, where the standard of living and the democratic rights of the working people are under constant attack and the menace of fascism and war is growing. But in those countries there is a working class and other sections of the working people, as well as progressive intellectuals, that is, popular forces that stand essentially on socialist and democratic positions and champion peace, and there can be little doubt that the future belongs to them.

The sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism is making itself felt with particular force in the disintegration of the colonial system. The trend is towards the complete abolition of that infamous system. India, Indonesia, Burma, Egypt, Syria and a number of other countries have already won their freedom. The Eastern countries that have shaken off colonial tyranny are seeking to build up their economies and regenerate their cultures as speedily as possible. The popular movement for national independence and freedom is expanding in all colonial and dependent countries.

Those countries which until recently were reduced to a colonial or semi-colonial status now want more than political liberation—they also want to get rid of the economic fetters which make them dependent on the capitalist powers. A bitter struggle for influence in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is taking place between the imperialist groups of the United States and Britain. The colonialists have had to withdraw from some of the countries, but they left there helpers recruited among the bourgeoisie and the

feudal chiefs, who, while pretending to uphold the interests of their countries, actually implement the policies of the imperialist conquerors.

At present we witness the emergence of other forms of colonial policy, used chiefly by the United States. When the military venture against Egypt by Britain, France and Israel was defeated the U.S. imperialists advanced the "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine," declaring that a "vacuum" had been created in the Middle East and that it was their duty to fill it.

Everyone knows, however, that there is no "vacuum" in the Middle East. Those areas of the Middle East suitable for habitation are densely populated by the freedom-loving Arab peoples—peoples with an ancient culture—who are working hard to wrest from nature her riches. The colonialist theory of a "vacuum" is an indication of the haughty attitude of the imperialists to the Arab nations and of their refusal to recognize the independence of the Arab countries, which they allege must submit either to the British or the French colonialists, or to their American counterparts. As for the peoples of the Arab East, they are fighting against British and French imperialism as well as against U.S. imperialism, well knowing that all imperialists are a deadly menace to them. Today the American imperialists are conspiring against Syria, using Israel in their vile game and inciting Turkey to adventure and provocation.

The imperialists are doing their best to prolong their domination in Asia and Africa. And since the colonialists still command substantial forces the danger threatening the peoples of the East should not be underrated. Nevertheless, ineluctable historical facts show that imperialist domination in the East is nearing its end.

The great power of attraction of the example of the Soviet Union, which has established beacons of socialism in the East—the prosperous Soviet republics of Central Asia—and the example of the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries are an inspiration to the peoples of the

East in their fight for freedom and independence. The peoples of Asia and Africa have disinterested friends—the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which consistently pursue a just policy fully in keeping with the interests of the peace-loving peoples. (*Prolonged applause.*)

From the earliest days of its existence our state has firmly rejected in its international relations all that was founded on plunder, force and conquest, and resolutely proclaimed the principle of good-neighbour relations and equal economic ties with all countries.

On November 8, 1917, Lenin said from the platform of the Second Congress of Soviets as he substantiated the provisions of the Decree on Peace. "We reject all the points that envisage plunder and the use of force, but we shall gladly accept all those points which contain good-neighbour terms and economic agreements; we cannot reject them." (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 26, p. 223.)

As soon as it came into being the Soviet state made the principle of peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems the basis of its foreign policy. As early as 1918 Lenin derided the harmful idea that the interests of international revolution forbid any peace whatever with the imperialists. At that time he wrote: "A socialist republic surrounded by imperialist powers could not, from the standpoint of such views, conclude any economic treaties; it could not exist unless it flew away to the moon." (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 27, p. 49.) Socialism and capitalism exist on one planet and their coexistence is a historic necessity.

We stand for the policy of peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries, for the conclusion of both bilateral friendly agreements to promote peace and of collective security agreements in Europe and Asia.

There are five well-known principles governing relations between countries with different systems: mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs for economic,

political or ideological reasons, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. The indisputable fact should be admitted that there are socialist and capitalist states, that they are following their own separate courses and that their systems are the concern of their own peoples. All international issues should be settled by negotiation, without recourse to war. Peaceful coexistence should be built on life without war, on the basis of peaceful competition (*Applause.*)

The Soviet Union, consistently pursuing a policy of peace, stands for mutually acceptable agreements with the Western countries on all matters affecting disarmament. It is willing to considerably reduce its armed forces and armaments, to ban atomic and hydrogen weapons, immediately discontinue all tests of those weapons and have international control set up, provided the Western countries carry out the same measures. We, for our part, are willing

If all countries, above all the U.S.S.R. and the United States, that is, two states which possess the greatest economic and military resources, succeeded in settling, in a businesslike spirit, in a spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding, vital international problems, including disarmament, then the chances of preventing a new war and establishing a stable and lasting peace for all countries and peoples would be greatly increased. The Soviet Union will firmly adhere to its policy of lessening international tension and improving relations with all countries, including the United States, since mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States could benefit the international situation to a decisive degree. In saying this we have no desire to improve relations between our two countries at the expense of other countries, by spoiling relations between the United States on the one hand and Britain, France and other countries on the other. In fact, our country would like to have good relations with all countries that are against war and favour peaceful coexistence, and we are doing all we can to establish such relations. The surest way to achieve this is to renounce the

“policy of strength,” since the ultimate phase of this policy is war.

The imperialists are trying to profit even from the launching of the sputnik by the Soviet Union. They are clamouring from the housetops, saying that the launching of the satellites threatens peace, threatens the capitalist countries with a new weapon.

We solemnly declare that our people have never thought, nor will they ever think, of using any means of destruction unless our country is attacked by imperialist countries. (*Applause.*) We are aware that since the Soviet Union has succeeded, through the efforts of its scientists, engineers and workers, in making the satellites, other countries, particularly such a highly developed country as the United States, can do the same. Of course, that which our country has achieved is of great importance since it signifies that we are ahead in the competition with the capitalist countries. But the first country to achieve this result should not inflame passions tending to aggravate the cold war and pave the way to an armaments race. For we know that the “policy of strength” and competition in piling up armaments lead to war, and war today means countless victims and the destruction of immense material values.

Not so long ago U.S. and British statesmen held a separate meeting, not for the purpose of finding a way to ease tension, but to increase it, and to continue the arms drive. We should like a summit conference between representatives of the capitalist and socialist countries for the purpose of reaching agreement, with due regard to reality and on a basis of mutual understanding, of ruling out war as a method of dealing with international issues, ending the cold war and the arms drive, establishing international relations based on coexistence and settling outstanding issues, not by means of war, but through negotiations, peaceful competition in promoting economy and culture, and in meeting man’s requirements as fully as possible. (*Applause*)

The Communist and Workers' parties and those Socialist parties which hold Marxist-Leninist views adhere to the same standpoint. Some bourgeois parties likewise advocate peaceful coexistence.

Today the peace-loving peoples are concerned, and rightly so, about the fact that the competition in question is going the wrong way. The recent conference between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain made it plain that the ruling circles of the two leading capitalist states intend to abide by the "policy of strength." The communiqué issued after the conference clearly shows that, on the pretext of an allegedly growing threat on the part of the Soviet Union, the ruling circles of the United States and Britain have reached agreement on fanning the flames of the cold war and increasing appropriations for means of destruction, that is, preparing a war.

The meeting of the Heads of Government of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc, scheduled for December, bodes nothing good for peace. Attention is attracted by the circumstance that in a number of NATO countries the governments have been, or are, headed by leaders of the Socialist parties. These parties, which call themselves Socialist, are actually carrying out the policy of the imperialist circles. They confuse the working class and try to make it appear that the Soviet Union is opposed to agreement on disarmament and easing international tension and allege that this forces them to continue the arms drive. But that is deception of the working people. And this policy, pursued by some of the leaders of the Socialist parties, is cunningly used by the imperialists.

It was not accidental that M. Spaak, the NATO General Secretary and leading member of the Socialist Party in Belgium, received an invitation to the recent Eisenhower-Macmillan meeting. The facts show that the imperialists are drawing the Right-Wing Socialists into the misanthropic business of preparing war.

But no matter what the imperialists resort to, their plans are doomed to failure. The peoples do not want war, they stand vigilantly on guard over peace, oppose and will continue to oppose the aggressive designs of international reaction.

The Soviet Union has always championed world peace and will continue to do all in its power to avert the danger of a new war. (*Applause.*) In the future, too, we shall strive for disarmament, prohibition of weapons of wholesale extermination, work to establish confidence between the peoples and make the United Nations Organization a genuine instrument of peace. (*Applause.*)

The more aggressive imperialist circles are striving to provoke conflicts wherever possible, to intensify the war danger and, in this way, divert considerable manpower and means from constructive labour in the socialist countries. Their tactic is to encircle the socialist countries with military bases, create and extend military blocs.

Imperialist reaction pursues the line of maintaining and intensifying international tension. The imperialists are pursuing the policy of cold war and want to maintain the arms drive. The most striking expression of this is the Dulles concept of keeping the world "on the brink of war." Acting in this way they aim at ensuring good business for the U.S. monopolies who, while waxing rich on the arms drive, are adding to the tax burden borne by the working people. For them a let-up in the tension and disarmament are not profitable. Abandonment of the arms drive would force the monopolies to switch industry from a war footing to production for civilian needs. This reorganization of production would benefit the people, but the monopolists are afraid to put it through because it will cut their profits from war orders. They are haunted by the fear of a worsening economic situation, of increased difficulties in marketing civilian goods; moreover, they dread that lessening of the tension and ending of the arms drive would deprive them of the possibility of keeping the working people in a state of fear,

of being able to intimidate people with the “bogey of communism” and of using this pretext for reprisals against the progressive forces working for peace. The policy of the cold war, arms drive and aggravating international tension is needed by the imperialists for the purpose of reinforcing the dictatorship of monopoly capital. They try to convince the workers that a militarized economy means full employment, that it is even advantageous to them. But the advanced workers, well aware of the instability of the war situation, know that prosperity cannot be built on the arms drive.

There is another perspective—that of developing civilian production. The possibilities for mutually beneficial trade between all countries are enormous. The Soviet Union, like the other socialist countries, has repeatedly expressed its readiness to engage in the widest possible trade. This, undoubtedly, provides a solid foundation for trade and economic contacts between the peoples; it is fully in keeping with our line of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems.

The banner of the socialist countries is a peace-loving policy aimed at easing international tension and consolidating friendship between the nations. And this policy harmonizes with the vital interests of the working people, with the interests of developing and consolidating the new social and economic system and stabilizing world peace. (*Applause.*)

Experience shows that the sole correct way in international relations is the policy of peaceful coexistence, the policy of strengthening peace and friendship among the nations. (*Applause.*)

In advocating peaceful coexistence, we, of course, have no intention of saying that there are no contradictions between socialism and capitalism, that complete “harmony” can be established between them, or that it is possible to reconcile the communist and bourgeois ideology. Such a viewpoint would be tantamount to retreating from Marxism-Leninism. The ideological differences are irreconcilable and

will continue so. But this does not preclude peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition between the socialist and capitalist countries.

With military technology at its present level the launching of a world war by the imperialists would in all probability lead to fearful devastation and loss of lives; use of atomic and hydrogen weapons and intercontinental missiles would be a terrible calamity for mankind. And the capitalist system, by evoking this calamity, would doom itself to irrevocable destruction. The peoples will no longer tolerate a system which brings mankind torments and sufferings and bloody predatory wars.

Although we are convinced that the outcome of another war, should the imperialists unleash it, would be the destruction of the system causing it, that is, the capitalist system, and that the socialist system would be victorious, we have no desire to achieve victory in this way. We Communists have never sought, nor shall we ever seek, to achieve our aims by such monstrous means—means that are amoral and contradict our communist outlook. We hold that war is not needed for the progress of socialism.

The socialist world system has powerful economic, political and military resources at its disposal. And no matter how the imperialists may rage, they will never succeed in breaking the growing strength of this system, will never succeed in halting the onward march to communism. (*Applause.*)

Comrades, we are witnesses of, and participants in, the great ideological and political upswing in the international communist and working-class movement. A big part has been played in this by the Twentieth Congress of our Party and especially by its conclusions on such important questions as peaceful coexistence of two systems, the possibility of different forms of the transition to socialism, the possibility of averting war in the present epoch, and the development of the socialist world system. The ideas of the Twentieth Congress were widely supported by the fraternal

Communist and Workers' parties. The recent congresses of the Communist Parties of China, France, Italy and other countries demonstrated the solidarity of the Communist Parties, their loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, their firm resolve and unshakeable will in the struggle for their great aims. (*Applause.*)

The international communist and workers' movement is developing under the banner of proletarian internationalism, under the militant and glorious motto, "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" (*Applause.*) Glancing back over the path traversed by the international workers' movement we proudly note that our predecessors were the glorious English Chartists, the heroes of the barricades in France, Germany, and Hungary in 1848, the men of the First International, the immortal heroes of the Paris Commune, and the American workers on whose initiative the working people of all countries began to celebrate the First of May—the day of international proletarian solidarity. (*Applause.*)

In 1881, on the occasion of the Slavonic meeting devoted to the Tenth Anniversary of the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels wrote to the chairman of this meeting: "When the Paris Commune fell after the atrocious massacre organized by the defenders of 'order,' the victors little thought that ten years would not elapse before an event would happen in distant Petersburg which, maybe after long and violent struggles, must ultimately and certainly lead to the establishment of a Russian Commune." (*Applause.*) The struggle was indeed long and brutal. The prediction of the great teachers of Marxism came true after three and a half decades.

We now have another forty years of arduous struggle behind us, and today, beneath the glorious banner of Marxism-Leninism, under the leadership of the tried and tested Communist and Workers' parties hundreds of millions of people are confidently stepping out along the road to communism. (*Prolonged applause.*) We are proud that the working class of the Soviet Union was the first to carry out the

socialist revolution, proud that our country, the great Soviet people with the valiant Leninist Communist Party at their head are in the front ranks in the march towards communism. (*Stormy applause.*)

* * *

Comrades, the results of the forty years that have passed since the Great October Socialist Revolution show what epoch-making victories the working class has won in the struggle to establish socialism. At present under the banner of Marxism-Leninism over 950 million people in the socialist countries are building a new life, doing all in their power to build socialism and bring nearer the triumph of communism. Socialism has ceased to be merely a question of theory, it has long been transformed into a question of practice, has become the living and creative undertaking of many nations. (*Applause.*)

Today hundreds of millions of people are marching forward under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. Tomorrow further tens and hundreds of millions will rally to that banner of victory. (*Stormy applause.*)

Celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution the Soviet people demonstrate before all mankind the successes achieved by them under the leadership of the Communist Party. Who can deny that the Soviet Union is now a mighty socialist state, a country of high culture, science and technology. The greatest success of the socialist revolution is the unprecedented growth of the culture of the people, the education of the new man—the active builder of communism. Rich indeed is the spiritual world of the man of socialist society, grand and audacious are his dreams and his deeds.

Formerly people said that red stars shine on the battlements of the Moscow Kremlin, but today the creative labours of the Soviet people have resulted in the launching of new stars in the universe—the first man-made earth satel-

lites. (*Prolonged applause.*) These sputniks are heralds of progress, heralds of the triumph of Soviet science and technology. They are justifiably called sputniks of peace. In circling the globe, the Soviet sputniks bring tidings of the heights gained by science and technology, by the entire economy of our country now building the new life under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. (*Stormy applause.*)

The Soviet country is entering upon its fifth decade. Bright and magnificent are the prospects of our forward movement. We sacredly recall the behest of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin to the effect that the best way to celebrate the anniversary of the October Revolution is to concentrate attention on the unresolved tasks. The Communist Party and the Soviet people are looking to the future and they concentrate their attention on those magnificent tasks of communist construction. The Party and the people are working on these tasks with firm conviction and profound faith in their creative energies, in the coming triumph of communism. (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the fortieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the great Soviet people who are building communism! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the mighty socialist camp! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long life and strength to the fraternal friendship of the Soviet people with the peoples of all the socialist countries, with all the peace-loving nations of the world! Long live peace throughout the world! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the inspirer and organizer of all the victories of our people in the struggle for building socialism and communism! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live Marxism-Leninism, our grand and invincible banner! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. All rise.*)

**INTERVIEW GIVEN
TO HENRY SHAPIRO,
CORRESPONDENT
OF UNITED PRESS AGENCY**

November 14, 1957

The chief Moscow correspondent of the American United Press News Agency, Henry Shapiro, requested an interview with N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. The request was granted and the interview took place on November 14.

Shapiro's questions and Khrushchov's answers follow.

Shapiro: Allow me, Mr. Khrushchov, to ask you about the prospects of the development of the Soviet Union in the near future, the prospects of changes in the political and state structure of the Soviet Union and in the cultural field.

Khrushchov: I do not know whether this is what you expect from me, but I can say that our economy is doing quite well. There are notable achievements both in industry and agriculture. And we now have greater possibilities for further economic progress, for raising the living and cultural standards of the people. The reorganization of the management of industry and building carried out this year, the extension of the rights of the Union republics and the local authorities will facilitate fuller and more rational utilization of our vast resources. Better conditions are being created for stepping up labour productivity, for cutting production costs and, hence, for greater accumulation of industrial reserves. This makes it possible to allocate funds for the continued expansion of all branches of industry, building more houses

and cultural establishments and expanding public services, and directly for raising wages.

Our industry is being replenished with fresh forces every year—young people who are better educated. Formerly the ranks of the working class were reinforced primarily by the rural youth, many of whom were semi-literate and needed long training to operate machines, whereas now the intake consists of young people who have had a seven-year or ten-year education. Moreover, large numbers have also had two years' technical training. Consequently, industry is getting a new type of worker. This, of course, results in better organization of production, better utilization of machinery and equipment and higher productivity.

Shapiro: I should like to ask you about the theory of the gradual withering away of the state.

Khrushchov: This process is, in fact, already under way. As the Soviet state develops, administrative functions change, and the same is true of some of the organs of compulsion. As regards our army, it fulfils the function of defending the Soviet state from external attack.

Take our judicial bodies. The number of criminals has considerably decreased. The militia and the judicial bodies deal mostly with cases of disorderly behaviour and crime, political offences are a rare occurrence nowadays.

Most of those who merited punishment in recent years for crimes against the Soviet state were agents smuggled in from abroad. Our authorities vigilantly protect the interests of the people, the interests of the Soviet state, and unmask these agents. The population itself, our Soviet people, play a tremendous and, I may say, decisive, role in this matter.

We are guided by the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state, by the splendid ideas expounded by Lenin in his classical work *The State and Revolution*. We have said, and we say now, that the state organs of compulsion will gradually wither away and ultimately die out, as will the state itself. But this, of course, will not take place abruptly, but grad-

ually, when communist society arrives at a certain stage of development. It would be a gross error, a leftist blunder, if at the moment we permitted any weakening of our state organs of administration, or abolished the organs of compulsion which, as I have already said, are now primarily organs for defence against machinations by external enemies.

Our state and its organs carry on extensive educational work among the citizens. This is where the strength of our state lies. If you have made an objective study of life in the Soviet Union you would have noticed the popular support for all the measures taken by the state in combating anti-social phenomena, elements who disturb the peaceful labour of the people. We are combating the survivals of capitalism in the minds of the people. Evidently among part of the population these survivals linger for a considerable time because the process of their elimination is a long and complicated one.

Moreover, the withering away of the state depends in large measure on the international situation. If international events develop more rapidly in a progressive direction, then the danger of external attack will steadily diminish. This means that the armed forces of the Soviet Union will be cut and all other state organs reduced and altered.

That is all that can be said briefly on the subject.

Shapiro: Regarding your statements on literature and art, I should like to ask whether an extension of the different schools in literature and art is likely in the Soviet Union.

Khrushchov: First of all let us ascertain what you mean by the term "school." Apparently, your understanding of a "school" is a definite trend in literature and art. But what is a trend? It is the reflection of the interests of definite strata of the population. Bourgeois journalists usually say that in the United States, in England, in France, they have schools and trends of all kinds among writers and artists. You in the United States, for example, have a bourgeoisie, but it is not homogeneous: there is the monopoly bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. Or take the

intelligentsia. One part of it gravitates more towards the working class, towards the working people, another part serves the big monopolies. Each class and each stratum within the class stands somewhat apart, has its own trend. But when all is said and done, there is one main division of the bourgeois society—exploiters and exploited

Our Soviet state has existed for 40 years. The young Soviet man of today only knows the capitalist from the stage. It is now necessary to create the “stage type” so that he can visualize a capitalist, because Soviet people do not come into contact with capitalists. They work in their own factories and plants. Everything belongs to them. The changes that have occurred in the life of our country have left their imprint on the psychology of the people, on their understanding of life, events and mutual relations.

There are not, then, nor can there be, any trends but the Soviet trend in our literature and art. By trends we understand, as I have said, reflection of the interests of definite classes and strata of society. Every trend has a material base and, consequently, a right to existence. There are no antagonistic classes and strata in the Soviet Union; there is a monolithic socialist society. There are only working people in our country. Hence, there is no need for the people, the writers and artists to generate a variety of conflicting trends. Our literature and art are inseparable from the life of the people, they reflect the life and the interests of the people.

You might ask: against whom are you fighting on the ideological front? The communist education of man cannot be effected by the wave of a magic wand. It is a process of struggle in the development of culture, in moulding the outlook of the Soviet man. The healthy trend challenges negative manifestations, bourgeois survivals and bourgeois influence. And this influence is not only possible, it is inevitable, because there are still capitalist countries in a considerable part of the world.

Take, for example, the American broadcasting stations which surround us. The vile fabrications and malignant inventions disseminated by them! Or take the leaflets which the imperialists smuggle into our country and the other socialist countries.

What do you think—should we “recognize” such “trends,” should we permit a handful of disgruntled elements who have sold themselves to the imperialists to bring in and disseminate their foul and scurrilous concoctions? Or, perhaps, should we permit these types, scum without kith or kin, to organize their foul “trend” in our country? The Soviet people would never tolerate this! They will not let anyone blacken their own government and their country.

Some bourgeois journalists sometimes say that the Party spirit in literature and art is a form of compulsion. For the Soviet writer or artist who loves his people, the Party spirit in his work, the desire to be of service to his people, is a natural necessity. This has been excellently expressed by our writers and artists themselves. The Party spirit is no burden for anyone provided it follows from the essence of his convictions. I have been a member of the Party for nearly 40 years and have never been subjected to a single disciplinary measure. I have never regarded as burdensome any obligations placed upon me as Party member by the programme and Rules of the Party. Why? Because such is my ideology, such is my understanding of Party tasks and obligations. Hence, for me as well as for all other Party members in fulfilling Party obligations there is nothing that hamstrings initiative, will, or understanding of events and, arising therefrom, the task of serving the Party, the people.

What is culture? What are newspapers, magazines and the press generally? They are a reflection of the life of the people. If a writer serves the people, lives with the people and is their servant, his work fuses with the interests of the people, the interests of the Communist Party and his own personal interests. The Communist Party is the vanguard, the most advanced part of the people. The Party has no in-

terests other than the interests of the people. It gives priority to the interests of the people, to improving the well-being and furthering the advance of our socialist society towards communism. Thus, identity has developed between the aspirations of the people and the Party which is the vanguard of society. Literature plays a prominent role, helping the Party to educate the people correctly, to impart to them the advanced, progressive ideas which guide our Party. So, you see, it is not accidental that we call writers the engineers of the human soul.

Shapiro: Does this apply to art also?

Khrushchov: To all forms of creative work. We shall encourage and support everything that is healthy in our literature and art. Not long ago a tendentious book by the writer Dudintsev appeared. Dudintsev was severely criticized for this book, despite the fact that it has interesting and powerful pages. We considered that it was necessary to correct him and to guard others against possible errors. I think that in time Dudintsev will write books for which the capitalist world won't praise but will abuse him.

Shapiro: In your speech at the recent session of the Supreme Soviet you said that the Soviet Union will catch up and outstrip United States production in the next fifteen years. You then gave figures for basic production—heavy industry. Does this also apply to the Soviet people's standard of living?

Khrushchov: Yes, unquestionably.

Shapiro: Does that mean that within 15 years the Soviet Union will have as high a standard as the United States?

Khrushchov: Considerably sooner, I would say, in the matter of foodstuffs. What is the standard of living? What does it signify? It signifies satisfaction of man's material and spiritual needs. Let us take first the question of satisfying the need for food. At present the needs of the Soviet people for bread and vegetables are fully satisfied. And everything is being done to fully meet their requirements for butter, meat and milk within the next few years.

We have already achieved a considerable rise in the standard of living. But we know that our per capita production is smaller than that of the United States. But the gap between the two countries in consumption of these products is narrower than the gap in production because the United States exports considerable quantities. Production and consumption are different things. Our collective farmers and agricultural workers have undertaken to catch up with the United States in per capita production of milk, butter and meat in the next few years. These are basic foodstuffs.

Shapiro: You have spoken about food, what about other consumer goods?

Khrushchov: I have spoken first about food because we Russians have a saying—the home is good not for what it looks but for what it cooks.

Now for housing. You, I take it, are aware of the recent decision of the Party and the Government to satisfy the housing needs in the next ten or twelve years. We aim at providing a flat for every family—a flat, not just a room. I cannot say how good all the flats will be. It may be that not all of them will have the conveniences that would fully satisfy all the people. For this a longer period, of course, is needed. But at any rate we shall abolish the housing shortage and create normal conditions with regard to urban and rural housing. Possibly in the countryside this will be accomplished much earlier.

As for providing the people with holiday homes and sanatoria, we can compete with any capitalist country. Nowhere is such attention given to the rest and recreation of the working people as in the socialist countries. Or take for instance, the health service. Free medical care and hospital treatment have been established for all citizens. And the medical services will continually improve.

Shapiro: What about education?

Khrushchov: There is anxiety in the United States over the fact that we are training so many specialists, that we have achieved tremendous success in higher education. To-

day it is not we but the Americans who are boosting our success in this field. And it is true, more young people get a higher technical or general education in our country than in the capitalist countries. We have even experienced an overproduction of some professions—lawyers, for example. Our main efforts are concentrated on training specialists in the exact sciences—mechanics, mathematics, chemistry, physics. I think that our country is well in the lead in training specialists. And the training will be improved and perfected continually.

Shapiro: The presence in Moscow of the leaders of foreign Communist Parties for the anniversary of the October Revolution has again led to talk about the possibility of a new international Communist organization—a new Comintern or Cominform. Is that the case?

Khrushchov: We consider that there is no need at present for such an organization. The Communist International played a positive historic role, and the Cominform did likewise. The Communist and Workers' parties have grown and become strong, so there is no need for a centre to direct the communist movement. As regards periodic conferences and meetings of leaders of the communist movement, we do not reject such forms; they are useful.

Shapiro: Have you in mind meetings of the leaders of all the Communist Parties?

Khrushchov: I have in mind first of all periodic meetings of the leaders of the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries. We should coordinate our economic development, promote cooperation in the various branches of the economy, which, in the course of time, will increasingly develop and expand. Naturally, we should also coordinate our political work.

Shapiro: What do you prefer—joint meetings of representatives of all the socialist countries, or bilateral meetings?

Khrushchov: We consider that both one and the other are needed—meetings of representatives of all the Communist

and Workers' parties of the fraternal countries, as well as bilateral meetings.

After all, the North-Atlantic bloc countries meet! It is a fact that in a way NATO, too, is a political organization which works out not only military plans but plans for action against the labour movement, against the national-liberation movement. The Right-Wing Socialists are accessories to the capitalists in this matter. Take the "Socialist" Spaak. M. Spaak is a real find for the capitalists: to have a Socialist glorify and defend the interests of the monopolies! What could be better for the imperialists! NATO is, in fact, an organization of the big monopolies, while its secretary is a "Socialist" who executes the policy of the monopolies.

The bourgeoisie thinks that it alone has the right to unite and establish its organizations. But when the working class establishes its organizations, when the Communist and Workers' parties send their representatives to a conference, that, you see, is a gathering of conspirators. No, gentlemen, it is a gathering of representatives of the powerful working class, a gathering of representatives of the powerful communist movement.

Shapiro: Do you mean an organized campaign for the unification of the communist forces?

Khrushchov: Absolutely, we are for the unification of our forces. We adhere to the Marxist-Leninist standpoint, for us the slogan proclaimed by Marx and Engels, "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" is a sacred motto. Only by uniting and coordinating its efforts will the working class of all countries accelerate its liberation. And the workers have realized this.

Shapiro: Will peaceful coexistence be possible if there is ideological warfare on an international scale?

Khrushchov: You ask—will it be possible? Yes, it is possible. Of this, in my opinion, there can be no question, because life supplies the answer. The Marxist-Leninist ideology of the working class and the bourgeois ideology have existed for a long time. They have long been carrying on a

struggle against one another, and not only within the boundaries of a single state. Nonetheless, both capitalist and socialist countries exist.

Shapiro: The capitalist countries fought together with the Soviet Union against Hitler.

Khrushchov: True, they fought together because their interests coincided. There are class interests—bourgeois and working class—there are national interests, and there are also contradictions between imperialist states. During the Second World War a situation developed in which the capitalist states were forced to unite with the Soviet Union against the common enemy—aggressive Hitlerite Germany.

Shapiro: Do you think solidarity of the countries friendly to the Soviet Union is needed now?

Khrushchov: The interests of the socialist countries always demand solidarity, cohesion and coordination of their forces, especially in view of activization of the aggressive policy of the Western countries. The Western countries, and the United States in particular, have set up NATO, the Baghdad pact, SEATO, which embrace many capitalist countries.

Shapiro: You mentioned contradictions between the capitalist countries. Do such contradictions exist at present?

Khrushchov: Of course they exist, and cannot but exist. For such is the nature of capitalism. Not only is it impossible to deny the contradictions between the capitalist countries, but it can also be assumed that they will become sharper. I won't say anything about the contradictions between the United States, Britain and France, for instance, in their struggle for "dominant influence" in various regions of Asia and Africa. The West German and Japanese economies are expanding rapidly at the moment, a development which cannot but alarm the British monopolies. West Germany's emergence to a leading position can hardly be to the liking of the United States monopolies since the former need markets, and the markets, for the most part, are now in the grip of the

American monopolies. This means that the West German monopolists will have to wrest positions from the American competitors. And sweet words won't be of much help in this matter. I could list "knots of contradictions" without end. And it's only fear of communism, of the popular movement for freedom and independence that, to a degree, tones down and smooths the contradictions between the imperialists, explains why they have not yet found expression in the form of armed clashes.

Shapiro: Would you say there are symptoms of a pre-war situation at the moment?

Khrushchov: At present, I think, a pre-war situation does not exist.

Shapiro: Is it non-existent in the relations between the capitalist countries or in general?

Khrushchov: Not only between the capitalist countries but in general between the capitalist and socialist countries. The imperialists, and Mr. Dulles in particular, are artificially inflaming war psychosis. Dulles' "brink of war" policy is the desire to keep fanning war psychosis, but he cannot go the whole hog because the correlation of forces now is such that he himself hesitates to overstep the brink

Shapiro: Do you believe that the prospects for peace in the immediate future are not bad?

Khrushchov: I would say, yes. Recall the situation just before the last war. Hitler Germany was all set for war; Germany, Italy and Japan had concluded the so-called anti-Comintern pact, the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis. Today, too, "axes" are numerous, but the former Germany is no more. Instead there are two German states with different systems. France is also different—the working-class movement there is very strong. Nor is Italy what she used to be, because powerful forces standing for peace have come to the fore. In general, the situation in Europe and Asia is substantially different. Whereas in the past there was but one socialist country—the Soviet Union—now there is the world system of socialism

Moreover, the Soviet Union is entirely different from what it was in 1941. Its economy, culture, technology and science have risen to a high level, and we are glad to see that America, which had always said that its level of scientific and technical development could not be attained by the Soviet Union, is now planning to overtake us in scientific development in two years, and some American leaders say that ten years will be needed. Well, go ahead, we won't argue—catch up with us in two years or ten—we will not be offended.

Now let us look at what is happening in the countries of Asia and Africa, in all the countries fighting for freedom and independence. Everything is in ferment, the peoples are freeing themselves from the dominion of the colonialists, they want to live like human beings, to be free. What did Britain gain from the adventure in Egypt? Nothing! Now the American imperialists want to take the place of their British and French counterparts in the Near and Middle East, but they will not succeed. The adventure upon which Dulles embarked when he tried to organize a Turkish attack on Syria is going awry in the military sense. But he, naturally, has not given up; he is now seeking hirelings who could be relied upon to stage a coup d'état in Syria and install a government that would do the bidding of the U.S. monopolists.

Take India, Burma, Indonesia, where the voice of peace rings loud and clear.

Who, in any case, can fight, now, in view of the forces that have taken shape at the two poles—the capitalist and socialist? The most tangible force is the West Germans. But not even they have any desire to fight, they've had enough, they still haven't got over the last war. The lesson they learnt has not been forgotten, neither the young nor the old want to fight, apart from the militarist circles tagging in the wake of United States policy. The German militarists realize that if they were to unleash war, then a few hours would

suffice to put all the bases of military significance in West Germany out of commission.

Such is the real situation. That is why we think that, in the long run, even the most bellicose can be brought to their senses. No matter how eager they are to fight, they can be put in strait jackets.

The 20th Congress of our Party has pointed out that a situation has been reached in which the forces of the socialist and neutral countries and even the progressive forces in the United States and other Western countries can avert war, providing we conduct a correct policy. We believe that the repelling of aggression in Egypt and the deterring of the Americans from starting war against Syria afford tangible proof of the correctness of the 20th Congress decisions. This does not mean that war cannot break out. I have already said, one cannot vouch for a madman. But the actual correlation of forces is such that the militarists and monopolists should think, and think twice, before launching a war. We are convinced that if war breaks out—and it can be started only by the imperialist countries since none of the socialist countries wants war—capitalism will be defeated and this will be the last ordeal inflicted upon humanity by the capitalist world, because capitalism will be buried once and for all.

Shapiro: Do you think that part of the world would survive an atomic and hydrogen war?

Khrushchov: Certainly. The losses would be exceedingly great, humanity would suffer terribly, but man would not disappear from the earth, society would continue to live and develop.

Shapiro: We do not know this, so far there has not been such a war.

Khrushchov: That is so, and it will be fine if there is none.

Shapiro: Not long ago you spoke of a meeting of representatives of capitalist and socialist countries. Do you think this is realistic?

Khrushchov: Such a meeting, I think, is hardly foreseeable in the near future. But it may be asked: why did I refer to it in my report and now I say that it is not likely in the near future? We believe that there is no other way out—a meeting must be held. The more obdurate they are, the longer they refuse to meet (and we have in mind not a tea-party and small talk), the worse it will be for peace. A meeting signifies that the parties, taking into consideration the actual situation, make a bid to reach the necessary understanding, but understanding can be achieved only through recognition of the existing correlation of forces, that is, recognition of the existence of socialist and capitalist countries and no interference in one another's internal affairs. The socialist countries are as solid as granite. We reject any kind of political conditions such as a German settlement on the conditions stipulated by the Western countries or discussion of what Dulles calls the East European question. There is no such question. There are countries which have their own social structure, and the relations between all countries must be based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence so excellently formulated by China and India and developed at the Bandung Conference.

Failing this, it would be useless to meet, because huckstering at a meeting will apparently get us nowhere.

Shapiro: Could not these questions be discussed through diplomatic channels or through the United Nations?

Khrushchov: We are doing something in the United Nations. In American law, I believe, the procedure is that litigants cannot call witnesses who are in their debt. If this procedure were introduced in the United Nations, then that body would work much better. Some of the UNO delegations often vote with the United States, but after the voting they come up to our delegation and apologize for not having voted for the Soviet proposals even though they believe them to be correct—what can we do, we depend on American credits. How can the many member-countries of the United Na-

tions, which are in debt to the United States, act independently?

The United Nations, of course, does something useful and that is why we belong to it. But it is a mechanism that stalls in its work. This must be taken into account.

The United States has now imposed its disarmament proposals on the United Nations, and wants the Sub-Committee to examine disarmament in the light of the proposals of the Western countries, that is, it seeks to impose on the Soviet Union conditions favourable to the United States and the other Western powers. But this is naïve. So we shall give the United States the opportunity to talk in the Sub-Committee without us. We have announced this and by this we stand.

Shapiro: You have suggested that the Commission should embrace all member-countries of the United Nations. But is it possible to reach agreement on disarmament with all the 82 countries?

Khrushchov: All countries, big and small, are interested in ensuring peace.

Shapiro: But the small countries have no armaments.

Khrushchov: The small countries, too, have a voice. If war breaks out among the Great Powers it will not miss them.

Shapiro: They lack real power to decide matters.

Khrushchov: They can exert moral pressure.

Shapiro: But, realistically, can disarmament be achieved with the help of small countries, without basic agreement between the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and the other Big Powers?

Khrushchov: Certainly not, that we know. But our proposal for a Commission consisting of all member-countries does not rule out other forms and methods of negotiation, bilateral, trilateral, etc. Why did we leave the Sub-Committee? The Soviet Union was alone there, while the other four countries were members of NATO. We sat on the Sub-Committee for three years and did our best. We accepted

many of the proposals made by the United States, Britain and France, but the moment we did so, the Americans, Britons and French immediately retracted, ran away from their own proposals. We for our part did everything to achieve agreement. The point is that the United States just doesn't want disarmament, and that being so, why should we mislead public opinion and pretend that we are conducting useful talks? We realized that the Western powers, by means of backstage talks, want to cloak their armaments drive, to gain time in order to continue stockpiling armaments and keep the world in a state of cold war. It will be better, in our view, if the Soviet Union does not participate in the work of the Sub-Committee; world public opinion will, at least, be able to see what its work is worth and exert greater pressure on the governments of the capitalist countries. The governments will be forced to take cognizance of the popular will, to seek agreement. As regards the Soviet Union it is always ready for reasonable agreement on disarmament problems.

Shapiro: It is your opinion, then, that there is no prospect of disarmament in the near future.

Khrushchov: What do you mean by near future? To me it is a rather vague concept. We are ready to sign appropriate agreements at any time, provided the other side shows the same desire.

Shapiro: But the points of view have not come any closer.

Khrushchov: Our point of view has been set forth in a fairly detailed manner, it is well known. Now it is up to the Western powers.

Shapiro: What do you think about the possibility of bilateral talks with the United States?

Khrushchov: We have made statements already on this, but our point of view is being distorted because some American leaders fear that an improvement in the relations between our countries would relax the international tension. A bilateral agreement between the U.S.S.R. and the United States would not, in our view, be detrimental to other coun-

tries. What we seek is improvement of our relations with the United States without detriment to the relations of our countries with other countries.

Disarmament is conceivable only when not just two countries, even the strongest, such as the Soviet Union and the United States, but when all countries support it. If our countries were to initiate disarmament, which is what literally all mankind hopes for, that would be a decisive step. But the ruling circles of the United States, expressing the interests of the monopolies, do not want to do this as yet, because of the monopolists' interest in the armaments drive. But the American people do not want war. They dread it. And this, I think, is not groundless, because as things are today war would be terrible; and the United States, throughout its existence, if we exclude the Civil War and a small war with Mexico, has never really experienced war. And if it is not averted, then the Americans will experience a cataclysmic war such as mankind has never known, it will engulf not only Europe and Asia but, and with no less force, the territory of the United States.

Some U.S. leaders threaten the Soviet Union, declaring they have girdled our country with military bases. That is true. They have girdled our country. But it should be borne in mind that modern military technique makes it possible by means of submarines and ballistic missiles to bring the vital centres of the United States under fire, and to blockade its ports. Which means that, with the modern development of military technique, the United States is just as vulnerable as all other countries.

Moreover, it is necessary to reckon with the fact that in the European and Asian countries the movement of the peoples against NATO, against the bases located on their territories, will continue to grow. The United States wants to retain military bases on foreign territories, regarding them as advance posts far removed from the American continent. But the bases are not in deserts, they are located in densely populated areas. What are bases? They are the territories

of Britain, France, West Germany, Norway, Denmark, Italy, Spain, Turkey and a number of other countries. These bases are close enough to us for a blow against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, but they are just as close to us for a counter-blow. It can be assumed that realization will come ultimately to the Germans in West Germany, to the French, Italians, Britons, Turks, Spaniards, Danes and others, that should the American imperialists use the territories of their countries for attack against the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving countries, retaliatory counter-blows will come from the Soviet Union. The peoples will understand that and, no doubt, raise their voices.

Shapiro: Are military bases losing their significance in connection with the development of missile weapons?

Khrushchov: Without a doubt. At one time bombers could be intercepted with anti-aircraft fire, artillery or rockets, but now nothing can halt ballistic missiles.

You will say, but the Soviet Union, too, will suffer. Yes, we too will suffer great losses. But look at our spaces and look at Germany, France, Britain. You don't have to be a strategist or military expert to see the substantial difference.

Shapiro: America also has vast spaces.

Khrushchov: True, but not at all like ours. You should also bear in mind that the United States has cities with highly concentrated industries—New York, Chicago, San Francisco and others. But our industry is more dispersed. Moreover, our reorganization of the management of industry has resulted in greater managerial autonomy, which has also improved our strategic position.

Shapiro: But that was not the main purpose of the reorganization.

Khrushchov: No, it was a corollary, but a very substantial one.

Shapiro: Do you think the United States does not have intercontinental ballistic missiles?

Khrushchov: I have no doubts whatever that it has not. If it had them it would have launched an artificial Earth

satellite as we did. We launched the sputnik on the basis of the intercontinental ballistic missile. The United States plans to launch a sputnik of eleven kilos. Do you call that a ballistic missile? Moreover, it is not yet known when it will launch this satellite. We have launched the first sputnik weighing 83.6 kilos, the second had a payload of 508 kilos, and, if necessary, we can double the weight.

Shapiro: Are you thinking of launching another satellite soon?

Khrushchov: So far there is no need to do so. We must study all scientific data obtained from the launching of the first two.

Shapiro: There is much talk now about a flight to the Moon.

Khrushchov: We are not seeking a place on the Moon for resettlement, we are not doing badly here. But, seriously speaking, the launching of artificial satellites by the Soviet Union is a big stride on the way to interplanetary flights.

Shapiro: Permit me to revert to the missiles. In addition to intercontinental missiles there are ballistic missiles that can be launched from bases.

Khrushchov: The United States has such missiles but not the intercontinental. For us the intercontinental missile is a problem that has already been solved. If need be, we can launch as many sputniks as you like—for that nothing new in technique is needed. All we need do is to instal the appropriate apparatus in lieu of a hydrogen warhead. We have developed a ballistic missile with a hydrogen warhead as well. Our missile tests, however, have been conducted with blank warheads. We would like never to have to launch missiles with hydrogen warheads.

Shapiro: You said earlier that with the development of missile technology all types of bombers become obsolete, but our military leaders say that this is not correct.

Khrushchov: What else can they say? Should they say it is correct the American taxpayer would declare: you took so many billions from us for bombers, what are you going to

do with them? It is difficult for your military leaders to relinquish the policy they have pursued so far in equipping the army.

Shapiro: Do you think that the Soviet Union has outstripped the United States not only in the field of intercontinental missiles, but in the production of missiles generally?

Khrushchov: Indisputably. There are some leaders in the United States who allege that we have been helped by German experts captured during the Second World War. This, of course, is nonsense. Judge for yourself. American troops occupied the German V-bases, carried away the chief designer and experts and all equipment. Yet the United States has not made an intercontinental ballistic missile.

The missile equipment in the U.S.S.R. is the work of Soviet science and technology, of our industry. These achievements are the pride of our Soviet people, of our socialist country.

Our designers have created missiles which, in case of attack on our country, can hit any base in Europe, Asia and Africa. Our missile—even on first launching—fell exactly in the target area. If we get agreement with the United States and other countries on disarmament, it may be that we could decide jointly to take the missiles to a proving-ground, put up a target and have a missile shooting competition before consigning them to the museum or destroying them.

Shapiro: Permit me to return to the internal situation of the U.S.S.R. After the June Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and now in connection with the release of Marshal Zhukov, there is speculation abroad about lack of stability in the Soviet leadership. Would you care to comment on that?

Khrushchov: We have a proverb—the hungry man dreams of feasting. The representatives of imperialist reaction would be delighted if the leadership of the Soviet Union lacked stability, and they dream about it. They have followed this mirage for forty years and they are still taken

in by it. That is understandable, because they are capitalists.

What do you have in mind when you talk about "unstable leadership?" Apparently that means tottering, shaky leadership. It is clear to any unprejudiced person that this cannot be said about the leading bodies of the Soviet Union. As for the changes in the composition of these bodies, they testify to the strength of the collective leadership of the Central Committee of our Party. Could an unstable, weak leadership have taken upon itself to remove from the Central Committee Molotov who had been in the leadership for dozens of years, to remove Kaganovich, Malenkov, Shepilov? Or take the question of Marshal Zhukov. Zhukov actually proved himself a splendid soldier and commander, a man who qualified for high awards. But he made grave political errors, for which reason the Central Committee removed him from the Presidium and from membership of the Central Committee. What does that signify? It signifies that the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. corrects anyone who commits errors, notwithstanding past merits. The Central Committee expresses the will of the Party, and the people follow the Party. That is what constitutes the strength or, as you put it, the stability of the leadership of our Party and Government.

Shapiro: Did not some of the officer corps get the impression that Zhukov had been treated unjustly?

Khrushchov: Just as a drowning man clutches at a straw so our enemies seize upon suppositions of their own. Disappointment awaits those who anticipated unpleasant impressions in connection with Zhukov's release. Our Party, people, and the personnel of the Army correctly assessed the decision. They manifested complete unanimity, they are closely rallied round the Communist Party and the Soviet Government.

Shapiro: When you speak of collective leadership do you have in mind the Central Committee or the Presidium of the Central Committee?

Khrushchov: We have in mind the Central Committee. The Presidium is the executive organ of the Central Committee.

Shapiro: Does initiative emanate from the Presidium or from the Central Committee?

Khrushchov: Matters affecting the Party's interests are submitted by the Presidium to the Central Committee for consideration. After discussion, the Central Committee makes decisions in keeping with the interests of the Party and the people. Collective leadership is not exercised by the Central Committee alone. It is exercised in the Party from top to bottom. The Central Committee is the supreme body of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. There are also Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union republics, territorial Party Committees, regional, city and district Party Committees, which also function on the principles of collective leadership. In the aggregate, this is the collective leadership of our Party. And it is this that enables it to effect leadership on all sectors of socialist construction.

Shapiro: Allow me to thank you for the opportunity of talking with you.

Pravda, November 19, 1957

**INTERVIEW GIVEN
TO MUHAMMAD HASSANEIN HAIKAL,
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
OF THE EGYPTIAN NEWSPAPER
*AL AHRAM***

November 18, 1957

N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the C.C., C.P.S.U., received Muhammad Hassanein Haikal, Editor-in-Chief of the Egyptian newspaper *Al Ahram* on November 18, and, at his request, granted him an interview.

M. H. Haikal's questions and N. S. Khrushchov's answers follow

Question: What are the aims of the Soviet Union's policy in relation to the countries of the Near and Middle East?

Answer: To put it briefly, the policy of the Soviet Union in relation to the countries of the Near and Middle East does not differ in any way from its policy of strengthening friendly relations with all countries. We are pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence of states, irrespective of their social and political systems, and we stand for consolidating peace throughout the world.

Such are the main principles of our foreign policy. At present the Near and Middle East occupies a special place in world politics. The peoples of this area suffered for a long time under colonial oppression. Now some of them have got rid of colonial rule, while others are engaged in a struggle for liberation. Not all the countries that have attained independence enjoy genuine freedom, and not all have achieved political independence. In some of the countries that have won independence people who pursue a

policy in the interests of colonialists continue to exercise a strong influence among the ruling circles.

We sympathize with national-liberation movements. It is the policy of the Soviet Union to contribute to furthering the independence of the countries of the Near and Middle East, to do everything to help them achieve economic independence as well. We want to help them develop their economy and culture so that they become really free and independent states. In our relations with the Arab countries, we adhere strictly to the Leninist policy of coexistence and non-interference in one another's domestic affairs.

Question. What, in your opinion, are the real reasons for the tension in the Middle East?

Answer. In our view the reasons for the tension are as follows. As a result of the national-liberation struggle the colonialists had to make concessions. At the same time they, especially the British imperialists, somewhat boastfully declare that they, if you please, met the wishes of the colonial peoples and bestowed independence on them. Such declarations, however, are designed for the novices in politics. The fact is they were forced to make certain concessions, because they could no longer hold down and rule the peoples by the old colonialist methods. They figured that it would be better not to bring matters to a crisis, so as not to be driven out by an armed uprising.

On the pretence that they are clearing out of their former colonies, the imperialists seek to retain their influence there, but in a more camouflaged way, so that the peoples should be ruled, not, say, by a British governor, but by local men bribed by the imperialists and conducting a policy in their favour. Thus, ostensibly meeting the aspirations of the peoples, the colonialists are actually continuing their subjugation of a number of countries.

But the countries that have won independence are keen on consolidating their gains. And this brings them into conflict with the colonialists' interests with the result that a struggle ensues. The nations that have shaken off the colo-

nial rule want governments that would really express the will and aspirations of their people. But these governments are not to the liking of the colonialists who try to overthrow them and instal governments that would be obedient to them. That is one of the reasons why the colonialists are in conflict with the peoples of the Arab East, and primarily with Egypt and Syria which are actively resisting colonialism.

The governments of Egypt and Syria are resisting interference by other states in their internal affairs. This, naturally, evokes the insensate hatred of the colonialists who resort to all means—conspiracies, infiltration of squads of saboteurs and individual agents with the aim of assassinating undesirable personalities and spreading all kinds of slanderous rumours.

The Near and Middle East is rich in natural resources and, strategically, is of key importance. Egypt, for instance, with its Suez Canal, is at the crossroads linking Europe and Asia.

When Britain, France and Israel attacked Egypt, the ruling circles of the U.S.A. formally condemned the aggression. But it is absolutely clear that had they really condemned it, Britain and France, which in many respects are dependent on the U.S.A., and Israel even more, since it lives on American charity, would have come to attention, they would have been docile and obedient. In reality this was but an allocation of roles between the imperialists. The calculation was that while the United Nations was in session and discussing the situation, they would consummate their evil deed and instal a puppet government in Egypt consisting of elements ready to carry out their policy.

Thanks to the resistance put up by Egypt and all the Arab peoples, and thanks to the action of other peace-loving countries, including the Soviet Union, this design was frustrated. The Soviet Union declared to the United States that if its attitude was really one of condemning and halting the An-

glo-Franco-Israeli aggression, then joint action should be taken against the aggressors. We knew, of course, that the ruling circles of the U.S.A., in view of their actual role in the aggression of the three countries against Egypt, would turn down our proposal. But, by turning it down, they thereby revealed their insincerity and showed that theirs was a policy designed to mislead the Arab world and create the impression that the United States was ready to play the role of patron of the Arab countries. And so we hold that by seriously warning the aggressors, the Soviet Union played no small part in stopping the aggression against Egypt.

When the French and British colonialists had discredited themselves, the U.S.A. pretended that it was hastening to their aid, putting forward, among other things, the notorious "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine." But this "support" on the part of the U.S. imperialist circles, calculated to retain imperialist influence in the Near and Middle East, is not unlike the support which the rope gives the man on the gallows. Creating the impression of supporting the interests of Britain and France, the U.S.A. is actually doing everything to oust them from the countries of the Near and Middle East, to undermine their influence in the colonial and dependent countries, and take their place. In pursuit of its aims it is conducting a more camouflaged colonialist policy than that of the British and French.

Where this leads can be seen from the example of Viet-Nam. When the national-liberation movement began there, the Americans insistently urged France to a campaign against Viet-Nam. It is common knowledge that as a result of the courageous resistance of the Viet-Nameese people, the French colonial divisions were exhausted and suffered fiasco. The northern part of Viet-Nam established a people's democratic government, while in the southern part, from which the French were also ousted, the Americans established their dominion.

We see the same policy in regard to Algeria, where the United States is taking vigorous measures to oust the French and replace them.

If the French Government fails to heed the voice of reason and solve the Algerian problem in a way that would safeguard both the interests of the Algerian people and French interests, then the U.S. imperialists will lay their hands on Algeria, too. But the avaricious imperialist monopolies in France, having lost common sense, are blocking the way to a solution.

The U.S. rulers have proclaimed the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine, declaring that they will not tolerate any "vacuum" in the Near and Middle East. Translated into plain language, the vacuum policy means that the American imperialists do not recognize the right of nations to decide their destinies without any patronage. But the days when this could be done have gone forever.

The American imperialists are conducting their colonialist policy in more modern forms, if I may say so, with kid gloves, but their victim is none the better for that. They are ousting British and French imperialism from the Near and Middle East. The smell of oil intoxicates them, they are losing self-control and are ready to resort to any means just to make the monopolies richer.

So when the Arab countries, above all Egypt and Syria, offered resistance to American imperialism, when the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine was spurned, they resolved to overthrow the undesirable governments. They plotted an uprising and sought traitors in the Arab countries. When this failed they tried to set Jordan and Iraq upon Syria. But here, too, they failed. And they failed not because the governments of Jordan and Iraq were averse to undertaking this adventure, but chiefly because they were not sure of their armies. They told the Americans pointblank that if put in the field their troops would side with Syria and Egypt.

As for Israel, the Americans, aware that an Israeli attack against Syria would be extremely unpopular, though Israel

would have willingly opted for the role of a gendarme, and conscious that attack by her would evoke the wrath of the Arab nations, ordered Israel to mark time. They decided to use Turkey—a Moslem country—against Syria. This plan, however, came to grief, as you know, owing to the determination displayed by the peoples of the Arab countries, above all Syria and Egypt, and also because of the action taken by other peace-loving states, including the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Government gave the necessary warning, stating that in the event of the imperialists unleashing war in the Near and Middle East, the Soviet Union would not remain aloof. In doing so the Soviet Union was not motivated by any political or economic aims, its sole interest was the preservation of peace and security of the nations. The Soviet Government issued its well-known statements, and we believe that, thanks to the action of the peace-loving forces, the first round of the struggle to frustrate the aggression, then under way against Syria, was won.

But it is necessary to be vigilant because the colonialists have not retreated completely, oil is a force which, like a magnet, attracts the imperialists. They will seek new means to attain their ends.

Such, strictly speaking, are the main reasons for the present tension in the Near and Middle East.

Question: I would like to clarify one point. Some people ask. Why did the Soviet Union act differently when Egypt was attacked than when Syria was threatened? In the first case, the Soviet Union gave its warning about a week after hostilities started against Egypt; in the second case, it acted in advance. How do you explain the difference?

Answer: Acquaintance with the steps taken by the Soviet Government to prevent the aggression against Egypt will show that we began to act not after the attack by Britain, France and Israel, but much earlier. The letters which the Soviet Government addressed to Mr. Eden and M. Mollet before the attack on Egypt, with the warning that if aggres-

sion were perpetrated against Egypt, it would fail, were published a short time ago.

Besides, while Bulganin and I were in Britain, we, in conversations with Messrs. Eden, Lloyd and others, six months before the outbreak of hostilities, tried to show that aggression against the countries of the Near and Middle East, if committed by Great Britain, would be utterly disastrous. But the British Government and the governments of France and Israel were so blinded by the desire to make short shrift of an objectionable Egyptian Government, that they ignored this, launched the aggression and brought great harm not only upon Egypt, but above all on themselves, since the failure of their aggression signified the crash of their colonial policy. For this failure the French and British rulers should blame not us, but themselves, because they acted unwisely. The Soviet Union fulfilled its duty as a Great Power, which was to avert war, or, if it broke out, to stop it.

Such, in brief, is the history of the events associated with the attack on Egypt last year.

As to Syria, we took account of the experience which showed that the colonialists do not always listen to good advice. So this time the Soviet Government issued statements beforehand after which there could be no two opinions as to the stand we would take in the event of war being unleashed in the Near and Middle East. And we are glad the Turkish Government took our statements in all seriousness. It is known, however, that in refraining from war the Turkish Government was prompted not only by reason, that certain steps were taken also by the U.S.A. Whereas at the beginning, it hustled Turkey, urging her to attack and dispatch Syria at the earliest date, later, when it realized that things would not stop at a military picnic, that it would be no easy matter to finish with the Arab peoples, with Syria and Egypt, that it was letting itself in for a lot of unpleasantness, it beat a retreat. Whereas at the be-

ginning it prodded Turkey to go to war, later it advised her to bide her time.

I rather think this will have a sobering effect on Turkish circles. They have seen that the overseas friends egging Turkey against her neighbours are not motivated by the interests of peace, but are, in fact, seeking to inflame passions against the peace-loving countries, to capitalize on the cold war. Turkish statesmen will, evidently, conclude that their overseas friends are not omnipotent, that there are forces against which the U.S.A. is powerless. We should, therefore, try to settle controversial issues not by inflaming passions and fomenting the cold war, but through negotiation based on peaceful coexistence.

Turkey is our neighbour and we would like to live in peace and friendship with her. Her leaders say Turkey does not want to fight the Soviet Union. They say this, however, because it would be senseless for Turkey to go to war against the Soviet Union—the balance of forces is, after all, too unequal. We want to see Turkey living in peace and friendship with all her neighbours. While we, compared with Turkey, are a strong power, there are also countries for whom Turkey is strong. It would be a good thing if Turkey were to take the principles of respect for their independence, non-interference and friendship as a guide in her relations with all her neighbours.

The Soviet Union, in relations both with Turkey and with all other countries, abides by the same principles—the principles of peaceful coexistence, friendship, business and cultural contacts, struggle for peace, against war.

Question: Perhaps the British and the French started aggression against Egypt, despite your warnings, because they did not know you had rocket missiles?

Answer: No, we told them about that when we were in Britain. We told them we had rockets. Maybe they decided that this did not correspond to reality, just as they now seek to console themselves by assuring the public that we, allegedly, haven't got all types of modern weapons. If there

are doubts, let us have tests on a common proving-ground; let us see who really has ballistic missiles and who not. For it is known for certain that neither the U.S.A., Britain, nor France has the intercontinental ballistic missiles the Soviet Union has.

Question: It would probably be an expensive thing to have joint tests. The launching of the satellite is in fact a test on a common proving-ground.

Answer: Evidently that is not enough for them. I suppose their rule is that it is not enough to see; it is necessary to feel, but the satellite cannot be felt.

Question: You told Mr. Bevan and some other Western politicians that the Soviet Union is in favour of a summit meeting with representatives of the Western countries to discuss the situation in the Near and Middle East. Does that mean the Soviet Union would take part in a conference at which the Middle East countries and their views were not represented?

What are the guarantees for the Middle East peoples in the event of the conference being held, bearing in mind that the Soviet Union supports the liberation movement of these peoples?

Answer: You are aware of our Government's statements to the effect that we want to banish the cold war and ensure peaceful coexistence, and, hence, also peaceful competition among all states, irrespective of their social and political systems. Peaceful competition must show which system is more viable, which accords more with the aspirations of the peoples and can satisfy more fully both the material and spiritual requirements of the people.

Our desire for peaceful coexistence, however, has not so far met with a positive response from the government circles of the main imperialist states. The cold war has not ceased. It is a burden on the peoples, both materially and morally. They want to rid themselves of this burden and really ensure conditions for everyone to live in peace and go to bed in peace, without fear that bombs will cut short

his slumbers and his life. The peoples want to be rid of the nightmare of the cold war.

We must, therefore, strive for peaceful coexistence. Peaceful coexistence is incompatible with the "positions of strength" policy, the "brink of war" policy, and the other things to which the imperialist powers resort. The representatives of socialist and capitalist countries should meet, exchange opinions and reach agreement, it is necessary to calm the world, and not only by words, but by deeds. The Soviet Union has demonstrated on numerous occasions its sincere desire to pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence: it concluded the state treaty with Austria and withdrew its troops from that country; it withdrew its troops from Finland and relinquished its military base there; it cut its armed forces by 1,800,000 men; it signed a treaty ending the state of war with Japan; it established diplomatic relations with West Germany, and it settled a range of other matters. We have made constructive proposals for disarmament, prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and halting their tests. I will not enumerate all the steps we have taken and all the proposals we have made—the list is a very long one. But they all stem from one root, the desire to prevent war, to rule out settlement of disputes by war.

The governments of the Western powers take an adverse view of a meeting of representatives of the socialist and capitalist countries. They reiterate that we adduce some sort of proofs, and want us to make political concessions. How do they understand political concessions? Apparently, they want us to disavow ourselves and abandon our socialist principles to please the imperialist circles. But the imperialists, and all the other cold war gentlemen will never see that.

One should pursue a realistic policy and recognize that there are two worlds—the socialist and the capitalist. Then it will be easier to abolish abnormal relations, end the cold war, and have friendly relations among states based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

How will all this affect the Near and Middle East? We make no distinction between the Near and Middle East, the Far East, West, South or North. All the nations, wherever they may live, want peace and tranquillity. The claptrap now being circulated by the imperialists alleging that we seek agreement with the United States on spheres of influence is, of course, utterly groundless, that is the terminology not of the socialist countries, but of colonialists and slave-owners who think that if a country is strong, it must own something and live off someone else.

We are a socialist country which has organized its state in a new way and has done away with exploiting classes. Our principles do not permit us to make terms with the strong powers to the detriment of the weak countries, at their expense. That is alien to the spirit of the Soviet state. In all negotiations, we always firmly adhere to the principles of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states, we help to consolidate the independence of all countries, help them develop their economies and raise their living standards and culture.

Question: In conversation with General A. H. Amer, you said the Soviet policy towards Egypt was based on definite principles and could not be ascribed to any of the Soviet leaders. Allow me to repeat in the text of the interview what you told General Amer on this score.

Answer: Yes, by all means do so; the Soviet foreign policy of peace is not the policy of one man, it is the policy of the Soviet Government.

Haikal: I have taken more of your time than I intended, and I would like to thank you for being so generous. In conclusion I want to ask you to book me a seat in the first rocket to the Moon. Many in Egypt expect that event.

Khrushchov: Let us not hurry. Let us arrange our affairs on Earth better, and meanwhile science and technology will make more progress.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
PUT BY BRAZILIAN JOURNALISTS
VICTORIO MARTORELLI
AND TITO FLEURY**

November 21, 1957

Victorio Martorelli, a Brazilian journalist, and Tito Fleury of the Record TV Company and the United Radio Broadcasting Companies of São Paulo approached N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., with questions concerning international problems and Soviet-Brazilian relations.

On November 21, N. S. Khrushchov received the two Brazilian journalists and answered the questions put by them.

Question: What do you think of the possibility of restoring Soviet-Brazilian diplomatic and trade relations?

Answer: I have repeatedly pointed out that the Soviet Union stands for normal relations with all countries without exception, irrespective of their political or social system. We think this is the only proper way to strengthen peace and friendship among peoples

In their entire history as states the Soviet Union and Brazil have had no conflicts or incidents. Quite the reverse. At the time when all the freedom-loving nations rose up in arms to meet the fascist threat to the world, the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and Brazil were on the same side in the struggle against the common enemy. I see no reason at all to justify the present absence of normal relations between the Soviet Union and Brazil, which is one of the world's largest countries in area and bigger than many European countries

as regards population. Absence of relations deprives our two countries of direct commercial contacts. Brazil cannot sell us her export goods, for which she does not have enough markets, and cannot buy our industrial goods, particularly the equipment and transport facilities she needs and obtains in insufficient quantities from other countries.

It stands to reason that we should welcome any step made towards restoring diplomatic and trade relations between the U.S.S.R. and Brazil.

Question: In the event of relations being resumed between our two countries, and considering that Brazil is the world's largest coffee producer, would the Soviet Union buy coffee from us? What other Brazilian products and goods are of interest to your country?

What products and goods could your country sell Brazil? In particular, could the Soviet Union sell Brazil oil-drilling and refining equipment?

Answer: The Soviet Union imports coffee and our consumers are familiar with Brazilian coffee. On a basis of mutual commodity exchange the U.S.S.R. could buy such Brazilian goods as coffee, cocoa beans, raw hides, sugar, cotton, etc. As trade contacts between our two countries develop, the range of goods exchanged is likely to expand.

As regards possible Soviet exports to Brazil, the Soviet Union, being a highly developed industrial country and a major exporter of machines and equipment to many countries, would of course be able to sell Brazil the types of machines and equipment she desires, such as oil-drilling, oil-refining, and electric power equipment, machine tools, road-building machinery, various instruments and appliances, and means of transportation, including tankers and automobiles.

The Soviet Union could also sell Brazil oil products, cement, metals, paper, cellulose, dye-stuffs, chemicals, etc.

Question: What in your opinion would promote cultural, sports and other contacts between the Soviet Union and Brazil?

Answer: First of all, of course, the desire of both sides to establish and develop such relations. For its part, the Soviet Union is prepared to work in every way for greater scientific, cultural, sports and other contacts with all countries, including Brazil. More contacts of this kind between the Soviet Union and Brazil would result from a normalization of relations between the two countries and the exchange of diplomatic missions. We would welcome visits to the Soviet Union by Brazilian educationalists, scientists, and sports delegations, and visits to Brazil by similar representatives of the Soviet Union. Why should not Brazilian students and specialists, for example, come to study in Soviet institutes and universities, and Soviet students and specialists attend Brazilian higher educational establishments? They could avail themselves of each other's cultural, sports, economic and industrial experience, learn from one another, and cooperate together. In our opinion, the limited contacts between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and Brazil are not normal. Once relations between our two countries are normalized it will be easily seen that our two peoples have mutual respect, sympathy and understanding.

Question: Can mankind expect a long period of peace, bearing in mind the possibility of peaceful coexistence between all countries regardless of their social systems?

Answer: It is extremely difficult to make exact forecasts on questions of war and peace, particularly in circumstances when there is as yet no agreement on such vital international problems as disarmament, the ban on weapons of mass destruction, and the establishment of a security system in Europe and Asia. We cannot dismiss the possibility that the reactionary forces might try to provoke a war and cause a new world conflict. But far from weakening, this only strengthens our profound conviction in the need to pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different political and social systems. Today, the alternative is either atomic war with all its consequences, or peaceful coexistence. The tremendous dangers which a new world war holds

for mankind dictate a persistent and determined struggle for the realization of the principles of peaceful coexistence. The forces working for peaceful coexistence and the prevention of war are growing throughout the world. The most aggressive imperialists are eager to precipitate a war. But they are encountering the increasing resistance of the peoples of all countries. That is why we can say that if all the nations, all peoples of good will work together for peace, they will succeed in curbing the aggressive groups in the Western countries and will thereby avert a new war.

Adherence to the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different political and social systems implies rejection of the "positions of strength" policy, exclusion of war as a method of settling international problems and an end to the cold war and arms race; in other words, it implies the repudiation of those particular factors which bear the seeds of a new war. Consequently, if all states firmly adhere to the principle of peaceful coexistence, that is, if mutual understanding and confidence is established among all states, if all controversial issues are settled by negotiation, and if ideological contradictions between the capitalist and socialist systems are dealt with through peaceful competition in the sphere of economics and culture, and in satisfying the material and spiritual requirements of man, we can confidently say that mankind will enjoy lasting peace. Precisely this is the supreme goal for which the Soviet state has been working throughout its forty years of existence.

Question: In connection with your answer we should like to ask your opinion as to the most dangerous breeding grounds of a possible new war.

Answer: It is hard to reply to a question of that kind. In a number of countries where the imperialists are still strong, there may be maniacs among the rulers, and maniacs often do not realize what they are doing. Such people may provoke a new armed conflict at many points. But today the clouds are thickest in the Near and Middle East, although I must say that even there rays of light are breaking through

the clouds thanks to the determined stand of the peace-loving countries. If the people continue to be vigilant, they can thwart all aggressive attempts to provoke an armed conflict in that region.

We cannot afford to ignore the possibility that aggressive imperialist forces may unleash a new war in Europe. The imperialists of some countries are doing everything to revive German militarism and concentrate their forces against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in Europe. Here we have a tangle of bitter contradictions. But if we were to make an objective analysis, there is nothing today like the pre-war situation which existed, say, on the eve of the Second World War. Further developments depend on many circumstances, above all on the vigilance of the peoples, on their peace efforts and their struggle to prevent war.

The third possible hotbed of war is Korea. Although hostilities in Korea have been stopped, large armed forces, particularly American, are concentrated there. We know that there are also corresponding forces in North Korea. We are deeply convinced that North Korea will not take any armed action, because the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic is doing everything to prevent war and unify the country peacefully. Meanwhile, in South Korea, where there is the large army of Syngman Rhee in addition to the U.S. armed forces, incendiary speeches are being made all the time. There may be madmen who may provoke a conflict.

The fourth possible breeding ground of war is Taiwan. Its territory, which belongs to the Chinese People's Republic, is occupied by the United States which is inciting Chiang Kai-shek, who has been installed there, to provocative acts. But can the Chinese People's Republic give up its territory? The U.S. rulers, who ignore the interests of the Chinese people, maintain a state of tension in that region and are reinforcing their hireling Chiang Kai-shek.

We might also mention Viet-Nam. Due to the actions of the U.S. rulers, the terms of the Geneva Agreements are not being fulfilled. The Government of South Viet-Nam follows a policy of embittering relations with North Viet-Nam and hindering national unification. South Viet-Nam is, therefore, another point where hostilities may break out.

These are the main spots where there is danger of a military conflict breaking out. This does not mean, of course, that such hostilities cannot break out elsewhere, particularly since aggressive U.S. groups are fanning the flames of cold war. The peaceful policy of the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries, the might of their armed forces, and the struggle of other peoples for world peace, are curbing the reckless imperialist war policy.

A theory of so-called local or little wars involving weapons of mass destruction has lately gained currency in the West. By means of such wars the imperialists want to suppress the national-liberation movement and overthrow undesirable governments. But we must not delude ourselves into thinking that in present circumstances little wars will be local. If such wars break out they may quickly develop into a world war.

Question. The launching of the two sputniks is, unquestionably, a major triumph of Soviet science. Of what benefit can sputniks be to mankind?

Answer. There is probably no such corner of the world where people failed to show an interest in the Soviet sputniks. This is quite natural because the artificial Earth satellites are the new word in science. They represent a big advance in scientific and technological thinking and the first practical step towards realizing man's dream of interplanetary travel. The benefits to mankind are unquestionable, like those from any other outstanding scientific discovery, provided it serves constructive, and not destructive purposes.

From observations of the flight of the sputniks our scientists have gathered extremely valuable scientific data which

will help man solve a number of important scientific problems.

Question: What influence, in your opinion, have the two Soviet sputniks had on slackening international tension?

Answer: The sputniks are primarily of great scientific importance, but they are also undeniably important to the defence of our country. After all they could only have been launched on the basis of firing an intercontinental ballistic missile.

The reactions abroad to the sputniks were mixed. First of all, there was admiration for the successes of Soviet science and technology. At the same time, people hostile to our country are expressing concern over the Soviet scientific and technical achievements and demand new efforts to intensify the arms race. The more sober-minded politicians have concluded, however, that it is high time to end the "positions of strength" policy.

In these circumstances, the Soviet proposals to disarm and ban atomic and hydrogen weapons—in brief, the entire complex of our disarmament proposals—should, it would appear, be welcomed by the Western powers. After all, our proposals set out realistic and very feasible measures designed to stop the arms race and rid the peoples of the burden of cold war. But in the Western countries, particularly the United States, another process is gaining momentum in connection with the Soviet successes in scientific and technological development. Those groups which shape U.S. foreign and military policy are gambling on an intensification of the arms race. No wonder the U.S. Secretary of Commerce recently repeated the old Hitler slogan of "more guns and less butter." But that is hysteria, which, if not curbed, may have terrible consequences, and primarily for those who fall victim to it.

The sputniks serve, as it were, to sum up the competition between the socialist and capitalist countries. And socialism has won in this competition. After taking power, the workers and peasants of our country surmounted tremendous

difficulties and wiped out tsarist Russia's former backwardness, built up a mighty industry, mechanized socialist agriculture and trained numerous intellectuals of their own. Socialism has brought forth people who are blazing new trails in science and technology. Thanks to the efforts of Soviet scientists, engineers and workers, the Soviet Union was the first to launch the artificial Earth satellites. And that is just another vivid proof that the economy, science and culture and the people's creative genius in all spheres of life develop better and faster under socialism. Yet our adversaries for decades insisted that the Soviet Union would never emerge from its backward state.

But we have done this, and have surpassed the leading capitalist countries in a historically brief period. This means that the task confronting the Soviet Union—to catch up with and outstrip economically the most developed capitalist countries—will also be successfully solved. There can be no doubt about it.

Question: Brazil must mechanize her agriculture. Could the Soviet Union supply Brazil with tractors and agricultural machines?

Answer. The Soviet Union has extensive experience in mechanizing agriculture. We sell tractors and different types of agricultural machinery to other countries, and could sell them to Brazil as well.

Question: Could the Soviet Union supply Brazil with atomic power equipment? If so, could Soviet engineers train Brazilian engineers to work in that sphere?

Answer: The Soviet Union is a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The purpose of this agency is to help countries to make peaceful use of atomic energy and, among other things, to train personnel. Therefore, the Soviet Union could cooperate with Brazil in this field as well, both through the above-mentioned agency, and directly through bilateral agreement.

Question: Could the Soviet Union help Brazil in devel-

oping a heavy industry, and what would be the form of such help?

Answer. If Brazil should approach the Soviet Union, the matter can be looked into. To develop their national industries, the Soviet Union supplies a number of countries with complete sets of equipment and renders technical assistance in building enterprises and training local personnel. Industrial equipment and technical assistance could be given on a commercial arrangement based upon equality, and without any political conditions whatsoever.

Question: What would you like to tell the Brazilian people?

Answer: I should like you to convey to the Brazilian people our best wishes for success in their struggle for the economic prosperity of Brazil, for a further consolidation of her national and state independence and sovereignty, and for international peace and friendship.

International Affairs, No 12, 1957

INTERVIEW GIVEN TO W. R. HEARST

November 22, 1957

During his visit to Moscow, W. R. Hearst, Jr., Editor and owner of "Hearst Newspapers" and the "International News Service," approached N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with the request for an interview.

On November 22, N. S. Khrushchov received W. R. Hearst who was accompanied by the American journalists F. Conniff and R. Considine and had a conversation with them.

The text of the interview is given below.

Hearst: Is this the same room I was in three years ago?

Khrushchov: Yes, we neither change our quarters nor our policy so quickly.

Hearst: I have noticed that you are quickly changing the appearance of the city. It has become better.

Khrushchov: In the future Moscow will change even more rapidly.

Conniff: I noticed that too. You have done a lot in the three years since our last visit.

Khrushchov: We also consider that the Soviet people have done a lot in this time. And a lot more will be done in the next three years.

Hearst: The successes in the construction of the city are especially noticeable on the approaches to Moscow from Vnukovo Airport where new buildings are going up.

Khrushchov: Yes, a new district is being built there.

Hearst: We were told that two million people would be housed there when the district is completed.

Khrushchov: You seem to be mistaken. It was envisaged to build two million square metres of living space in the district. But the plan has now been revised and will be somewhat enlarged.

Hearst: We were also greatly impressed by the fact that there are considerably more cars on the roads. The standard of life is rising

Khrushchov: Our growth should not be measured by the number of cars. We are not as yet seeking to compete in this respect as we do not consider the number of cars to be the main indication of the growth of the well-being of the people. So the increase in the number of cars on the roads of Moscow is not, in our opinion, most characteristic of the growth of our economy, of our development.

Hearst: The improvements that have taken place here are to be seen everywhere. Now, three years or so have passed since our last meeting. Do you think any progress has been made during this time towards a better understanding between the leaders of our countries? I will not in this case touch upon the problem of mutual understanding between our peoples.

Khrushchov: No, unfortunately, the situation has not changed. A duel of words is continuing and it leads not to the alleviation and improvement of relations between our countries but on the contrary to the worsening and aggravation of our relations. We are dissatisfied with such a situation and do all we can to improve relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. But this depends not only on us. The other side, i.e., the American ruling circles, does not appear to want this.

Hearst: That is a pity. We want mutual understanding but we don't seem to be able to find a method of achieving this. We had a proposal to begin by establishing something like an inspection line in Europe. I understand that at pres-

ent there does not exist the necessary confidence, the necessary faith in each other, but such an inspection could perhaps lead to the creation of such confidence. What is your opinion on this point, Mr. Secretary?

Khrushchov: What sort of inspection do you mean?

Hearst: I mean an inspection which could be carried out on the ground, by means of radar, and aerial inspection. It seems to me that the main reason for the creation of NATO was, in the opinion of its organizers, defence against a possible Russian aggression. The governments of the West European countries evidently want to have such an organization. When two parties regard each other with suspicion they seek mainly to prevent a surprise attack. I am not now speaking specifically of our country. In any case we have no designs of delivering a surprise attack against any country, be it Mexico, Canada or Syria, though we have heard words here to the effect that America is being looked upon as an aggressor, a warmonger. There exist certain circles who are afraid that Russia may fill a vacuum, if such is created, where the Western countries do not have their defences. Therefore I think that aerial inspection, radar inspection and ground inspection could help to eliminate mutual suspicions and this could then lead to the establishment of confidence. That is why my only hope is that both sides should approach the problem in this way and thus improve this unhealthy situation. However, it seems I am giving too long an answer to your question, but I wanted to make my point of view clear.

Khrushchov: You see, this question has already been under discussion between our countries. You evidently are well acquainted with our proposals on the question of disarmament with the establishment of international inspection. We continue to hold such views. But you know that the American side, and Britain and France after it, renounced the proposals that they themselves had put forward. Thus, for example, the U.S.A., on the pretext of preventing a surprise attack, has for some time been stubbornly

insisting on aerial inspection, on aerial photography of the territories of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. We believe that aerial photography can neither prevent a surprise attack nor ensure the necessary control over disarmament. Nevertheless we stated our readiness to examine the question of aerial inspection seeing that due to the stand taken by the U.S.A. and supported by Britain and France this question has become a major obstacle in the disarmament negotiations. However, when we submitted a proposal that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. should specify equal zones on their respective territories to be subjected to aerial inspection, the U.S.A. did not accept this proposal. And in general a situation has been created when as soon as we accept some proposals of the United States of America, Britain and France, the governments of these countries renounce their own proposals, complicate and link them with clearly unacceptable conditions so as to prevent agreement.

The way you raise the question is—first inspection, then the establishment of confidence. But we believe that first confidence between countries should be achieved and then inspection established. The solution of this complicated problem can be reached gradually by bringing about mutually acceptable solutions. And then if the mutual desire exists it will be possible to arrive at an adequate inspection which is conceivable only in conditions of mutual trust.

Hearst: First—inspection, then—confidence. That is just how I see it, because, somehow, it does not seem to work out otherwise.

Khrushchov: I should like to develop my idea further. If inspection is established without confidence, this will not be inspection. With spoiled relations between countries such inspection becomes a form of military intelligence aimed at choosing the most favourable moment for either of the parties to commit aggression. We entertain no thoughts of committing any aggressive attack and will certainly not accept such inspection. But if conditions of mutual confidence

are created between countries, then establishment of inspection will present no difficulties.

If, for instance, there were any need for mutual inspection between the Soviet Union and India, we would agree to any form of inspection, because we consider that India is a peaceful country, that it harbours no designs against us just as we harbour no designs against her. Such inspection, therefore, would in no way alarm the Soviet Government, the Soviet people. But when numerous statesmen and politicians in the United States, as also your generals, speak so much of their claims to world domination and openly proclaim plans of a military attack on the Soviet Union, and, at the same time, demand the instant acceptance of their proposals concerning the establishment of a system of inspection on the territory of the Soviet Union, we, naturally, cannot agree, for it would be tantamount to allowing American military intelligence to collect information necessary for preparing an attack on our country. Prominent personalities in your country publicly say that, using military bases around the Soviet Union, they can wipe our country off the face of the earth any time they see fit to do so. You yourselves know how much, and how unreasonably, certain noted United States personalities boast, and more especially some of your generals. And yet they say in the same breath: give us the right of inspection on the territory of the Soviet Union. Do they need this for peaceful purposes? Of course, not. Who will believe that such an inspection is needed for peace, for attaining a greater degree of international confidence in the present atmosphere of the arms race, war psychosis and mistrust?

Our belief and our position today is that conditions should be created that would preclude the possibility of a surprise attack by some countries against others. To this end we suggested the following system of inspection: to establish control posts on a reciprocal basis primarily at railroad junctions, highways and ports, and then at airfields. It is not everywhere that such posts need be set up, but on-

ly in certain specific zones, or, to use the military idiom, jumping-off positions, so as to prevent this or that country from being able to build up forces for a surprise attack. We likewise agreed to the establishment of aerial inspection in a belt extending 800 kilometres in depth along both sides of the dividing line in Germany between our troops and those of the Western powers. Our position has not changed. We are prepared to agree to these measures. But the United States, Britain and France do not accept these proposals. Is this conducive to the establishment of greater confidence between the two sides?

Hearst: One small question. This must be what you meant when you said that Russia had accepted a number of Western proposals whereupon the Western powers had renounced them.

Khrushchov: Not only that. Recall, for instance, the proposals concerning the levels of armed forces. The original Western proposals said that it would be expedient for the three powers, namely, the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., and the P.R.C., to have armed forces within the range of one to one and a half million men, while Britain and France should have no more than 650,000 men. In the course of subsequent discussions, the American representative, Mr. Stassen, named somewhat different figures, namely, 25 million for the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., and the P.R.C., and 750,000 for Britain and France. The representatives of Britain and France agreed to this proposal of Mr. Stassen. But what happened? When we accepted this proposal, the United States and France backed out. How can this be explained?

Hearst: Yes, I remember this.

Conniff: Allow me to ask you a question. You speak of the necessity of improving relations among all countries. How will the somewhat tough terms in the Declaration adopted by a meeting of Communist leaders and published today contribute to such improvement?

Khrushchov: I don't know to what Mr. Conniff is referring in the Declaration when he calls it tough. It sets forth the

positions and views of the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries which stem from their programmes and rules, from the Marxist-Leninist teaching which lies at the root of all their work. There is nothing tough about it. On the contrary, it says that the Communist and Workers' parties regard the struggle for peace as their paramount task, that they will strive for peaceful coexistence between countries with different government, political and social setups. The Communist Parties are being set the task of working to ensure world peace. I do not see anything "tough" in this.

Conniff: My impression is that some of the Declaration's references to the United States will, in all probability, be received in the United States as couched in an inimical language. I do not speak of the basic trend of the Declaration which, of course, reflects the views of the Communist Parties. What I mean is that these references to the U.S.A. will be interpreted in my country as a none too friendly step toward it.

Khrushchov: I do not see why the United States should construe it as an unfriendly step. The Declaration expounds the positions of parties working to build a socialist society. It is, of course, quite natural that our socialist positions should not be to the liking of certain American circles at the head of the parties which abide by the opposite, capitalist positions. But then we do not expect them to welcome this Declaration, since the position of the Communist and Workers' parties, set forth in the Declaration, and the position of the bourgeois parties are ideological opposites.

However, all this belongs to the sphere of ideological struggle. If the ruling quarters of the United States recognized the indisputable fact that there exists and develops today a world of socialism with its own ideas and a world of capitalism dominated by the old order, they would admit the possibility of coexistence between the two social systems in contemporary society. Having recognized this, they would recognize that ideological struggle should not lead to con-

licts, let alone military clashes between countries with different social and political systems. These countries can and should coexist peacefully and prove, in peaceful competition, which system offers the greatest advantages to society.

As for the Declaration, it is infused with peaceful aspirations. It speaks of the necessity of the peaceful coexistence of states and urges all the forces of peace to fight against the threat of a new war. It says that the most important task in the world today is to fight in defence of peace, that the Communist and Workers' parties are pressing for joint action on the broadest possible scale with all peace-loving forces, with all those who do not want war. The participants in the Conference announced their readiness to support the efforts of all states, parties, organizations, movements and individuals standing for peace, against war, for peaceful coexistence, for a reduction of armaments, for banning nuclear weapons and tests. Is there anything tough or unfriendly with regard to the United States in this?

Considine: Permit me, too, to ask you a question. This new Declaration is virtually dominant in the minds of people today. It is clear that it is a measure of the unity of views of Socialists and Communists. It is equally certain that it will be interpreted differently in different countries. What, in your opinion, are the three salient points of the Declaration?

Khrushchov: The Declaration is a big document which covers a fairly broad range of questions. But apparently you have read it negligently. Had you read it carefully, you would have easily pinpointed its basic, key propositions. Naturally, different people would select different propositions. If I were to tell you my opinion as to which are the three salient points in the Declaration, our opinions might well fail to coincide.

Considine: I will read the Declaration carefully and certainly learn it by heart.

Khrushchov: It is not poetry to be learned by heart, but it is necessary to understand the substance of this document.

Conniff: It seems to me that Lenin said in his time that simplification leads to better understanding. Therefore, I tried, in reading this document, somehow to simplify it and thus make it easier for our readers to grasp its meaning, for it is obvious that they themselves would not be able to find their way in this huge document.

Khrushchov: You would do a useful thing by gaining a clear understanding of the Declaration and understanding its basic propositions. But I have little confidence that you will bring through to your readers the basic propositions of the Declaration in the spirit in which they have been set forth. After all, yours is a totally different ideological position. That is why I cannot have any great faith in your objectivity.

You'd prove objective, Mr. Hearst, if you published the Declaration in your papers in full and thus enabled your readers, the whole of the American public, to read the document for themselves and to grasp its substance. Then they would be able to judge for themselves what in it is acceptable for the American reader, and what is not. They would be able to read the Declaration in its original form, instead of learning of it from one-sided and often slanted summaries presented by somebody else. I can assure you that you would be doing an excellent service to your readers. Can it be hoped that you will publish the Declaration?

Hearst: I should like to tell you, honestly, that our papers do not usually publish in full documents as big as this. This is usually done by such papers as the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald Tribune* and some others which are larger than our papers. It sometimes happens that we do not publish in full even very important statements by our President when they last 30 minutes or an hour. Thus, we cannot promise you that our papers will publish so long a document in full. But I can assure you that we shall endeavour, most sincerely, to sum up, as we usually do, the most important parts of the Declaration, and, as usual, supply them with editorial comments.

Considine: When I asked my question, I wanted to establish your views on the salient points of the Declaration

Hearst: It would help us to understand the Declaration better and, accordingly, would help the American people to grasp its meaning better. You are quite right. We haven't had time to read the Declaration. All we have read are a few reports on it sent to the United States at about four or five in the morning. Therefore, our impression of the Declaration is not based on a thorough study. We concentrated mostly on what it had to say about the United States and, from this, drew the conclusion that it speaks of our country in a somewhat truculent way. Possibly we shall arrive at a different conclusion once we have studied the document in full. I can assure you that if we are mistaken, we shall correct our mistake and shall try to outline the substance of the document objectively.

Khrushchov: It would be well, for this would help greater mutual understanding.

Concerning the policy of the ruling quarters of the United States Naturally we do not agree to the role claimed by the United States, namely, world domination The main thing in the Declaration is concern for the development of the socialist countries, for ensuring peaceful coexistence with all countries which have government and social systems differing from those of the socialist countries. I repeat, the main thing in the Declaration is the most sincere desire of our parties to secure a stable and durable world peace.

Considine: Allow me to ask another question. We have noticed that the Yugoslav representatives did not sign the Declaration. Were any efforts made to prevail upon Yugoslavia to sign the document?

Khrushchov: To sign or not to sign a document is a strictly voluntary matter. Every country decides for itself whether it will take part in drafting some document, or not.

The representatives of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia did not take part in drafting the Declaration and they will decide for themselves their attitude to this

document. As for the policy of the Yugoslav Government and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia it has been set forth in the speech by Comrade Kardelj at the Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet and in President Tito's article published in *Pravda*. We believe that these statements gave a good picture of the Yugoslav position on the question of friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

Another document, a Peace Manifesto, adopted by all the Communist and Workers' parties and scheduled to be published on November 23, bears, among others, the signature of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

Considine: The Declaration speaks of the necessity of preserving and strengthening the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Does this mean that the Soviet Union will supply the member-countries with the latest arms, including atomic arms and other, recently invented, weapons with a view to strengthening the organization?

Khrushchov: This question could not, naturally, be discussed at the meeting for it belongs to the military sphere, and the military did not take part in the meeting. Whether the armies of the countries signatories to the Warsaw Treaty will be supplied with modern arms, including rockets with atomic and hydrogen warheads, will depend on the situation, and on the line to be followed by the countries belonging to the North Atlantic bloc. Moreover, the missiles possessed by the Soviet Union are designed for use from its own territory so that there is no necessity to station them in Warsaw Treaty countries. We also have short-range missiles. Our military units stationed in the German Democratic Republic, naturally, have all types of weapons necessary to make them combatworthy to repulse an aggression.

Considine: Could you clarify that point? What military units do you mean, the Soviet Army or the East German army?

Khrushchov: The Soviet Army, naturally.

Considine: You said that another declaration will be issued on November 23. Considering that the present inter-

view will not be published until Sunday, could you tell us, in the most general terms, about the substance of the new document? Will a new peace plan be put forward?

Khrushchov: The struggle for peace requires great efforts on the part of the peoples and they should do their utmost to avert war and to ensure world peace. This is the principal point of the Peace Manifesto.

Conniff: You may, perhaps, help us to understand the Declaration by explaining what is meant by the expressions "the ruling circles of the United States" and "the working people and the working class of the U.S.A." There seem to be different interpretations of these terms.

Khrushchov: The ruling circles are ruling circles. The working class is the working class. It seems to me that these definitions are clear in every language.

Hearst: It appears to me that the working class makes up the majority of the population in the United States and, in the final analysis, all questions in our country are settled by voting at the elections. It seems to me that the working class is the ruling class in our country. We have families with more money than others, but in the final count, they have no decisive influence. Everything depends on the government.

Khrushchov: That's it, Mr. Hearst, much depends on the government. If you want to have a discussion on this question, please consider that it will take some time. The working class in the United States does account for a majority of the population but it has no power in your country, no means of production, no radio stations. Who has them? The rich, the monopolists. They also control nearly all of the press. They mould public opinion through radio, television, books, newspapers, cinema. All the means of political, economic and moral influence are held by capitalists, by the richest monopolies. Profiting by the fact that the class consciousness of a considerable part of the American workers is still rather low, they persecute those who have progressive ideas, use every possible means to shape public opinion,

induce the people to vote for the candidates who pursue a policy in the interests of the selfsame monopolies. It should be said that capitalists in the United States have thought up and are using a clever democracy which still misleads millions of people. But the time will come when the working class will understand, will realize its strength and really vote as its class interests prompt it to. The working class will say: I am the master. I create all the values and they should, therefore, be distributed in the interests of the whole of the people and, in the first instance, the interests of those who create these values, the interests of the working class, the labouring peasantry and intellectuals.

Don't be afraid of this, as a capitalist. If you write objectively, we shall intercede with the working class of the United States on your behalf. We shall say that though Mr Hearst is a capitalist he did, once in a while, display some objectivity within the limits of the possible. (*Laughter.*) And here I can quote history. There was in Russia a capitalist, Savva Morozov, who rendered material aid to our party through the writer Maxim Gorky. There was in Britain a capitalist who gave money for the lease of a building for a party congress, provided the money was returned when the Bolshevik Party came to power. We did so. We always keep our word.

Hearst: I regret very much that both sides lack understanding of how our two systems function, how they work. I have been listening to everything you said and yet I cannot believe a single word. One thing is clear—that both sides are satisfied with their systems. We, naturally, do not speak the same language, but we cannot even achieve the same understanding of one and the same words, even when we speak through a good interpreter. We seem to understand them differently. I agree that the future will lead to some solution. But that takes time.

Khrushchov: It is quite natural that we speak different languages. That should not surprise you particularly. We really understand in a different way the processes taking

place in society. We stand for the socialist system, you—for the capitalist system. You think that the socialist system is not suitable for you and you are taking measures to strengthen your capitalist system. We are taking measures to strengthen our socialist system. This is precisely what different languages are. As we understand things differently, we shall, apparently, not find a common tongue. In order to find some common tongue, one side or the other must give up its ideology—either we must give up ours, or you must give up yours. We do not expect this from you, and you, apparently, do not expect it from us. Then what next? This is where sober-mindedness, true realism, is necessary, we must show sound judgement and say: Two systems exist in the world—the socialist and the capitalist, let us allow history to settle which is the best.

The United States of America is the most developed and the mightiest capitalist country. The mightiest socialist country is the Soviet Union. Let us direct all our efforts towards the settlement of issues not by means of the arms race and the accumulation of war materials, which may lead to an armed conflict, but let us direct our efforts and means towards the development of economy, towards improving the well-being of the people, their culture, that is, let us coexist. Let people decide not with arms but with their reason which system suits them best. We stand on such positions. We say: society develops in accordance with its laws, and so the era has come when capitalism has to make way for socialism, as a higher social system than capitalism. This does not depend upon me, a Communist, neither does it depend upon you, a capitalist. No, it is an objective historical process. This has been proved very well by Marx and Engels, developed and continued by Lenin.

I should like to tell you, Mr. Hearst, and through you the people of the United States of America, that the Soviet Union stands for peace and peaceful coexistence. Our country will never begin war, if it is not attacked. We do not contemplate war either against the United States of America

or against any other country, irrespective of whether that country is near to the Soviet Union or far from it, for that is contrary to the spirit of our ideology. We want to compete in peaceful construction, in constructive work.

I also want to tell you, Mr. Hearst, that in the creation of new types of weapons we have outstripped your country. We now possess the absolute weapon, perfect in every respect and created in a short period of time. I am not saying this to intimidate, there is no need for that, I am simply stating a fact: our scientists, engineers, technicians, workers have produced the most up-to-date weapon. The Soviet Union possesses intercontinental ballistic missiles, it has missiles of different systems for different purposes, all our missiles can be fitted with atomic and hydrogen warheads. Thus, we have proved our superiority in this question. And if war now breaks out—and it can be unleashed only by the aggressive circles of the United States of America, because other countries will not dare to unleash it—then this will be a great misfortune for the peoples of those countries, on whose territories American bases are situated and from which the U.S.A. is preparing to strike a blow at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Obviously, the peoples, whose governments have, behind the peoples' back, permitted American military bases to be set up on the territory of their countries, may suffer severely. This is not a threat, either. But since the U.S.A. has set up military bases and wants to strike blows at the Soviet Union from these bases, we shall be forced to take protective measures. The American bases are not situated on plots of wasteland, but on densely populated territories, and we hope that the peoples of those countries, where the military bases are situated, will soberly appraise the situation and realize what military blocs, NATO in the first place, lead to. That is the first point.

The second point is that it should be taken into account that the United States of America has never actually waged war on its own territory and your people do not know what

war means. If a war is unleashed now by the aggressive circles of the U.S.A., it will be waged not only in Europe, in Asia or Africa, this war will immediately be carried on to the territory of the United States of America because now the intercontinental ballistic missiles make it possible to hit a target in any area of the globe. In this case, the American people will suffer enormous losses. All means—intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine missiles and other means which now exist—will be used in case of an armed conflict. You yourself understand that is the logic of war, the logic of struggle.

But we do not want to compete in matters of armaments. Let us take into account the situation which has actually arisen and reject war as a means of settling issues, let us establish proper control in order to preclude a sudden attack by one or another country; let us create conditions which would promote greater confidence between our peoples. Let us trade, even if not in strategic goods, as you call them, then in goods in general. If it is unprofitable for you to trade with the Soviet Union, then let us formally eliminate the discrimination which exists in the trade between our countries. This will promote trust. Let us exchange cultural and scientific attainments, in a word, compete in the peaceful field.

At present, real war hysteria is being fanned in the U.S.A. The reactionary forces of the U.S. monopoly circles interpreted the launching of the satellite in the Soviet Union as a military threat to the U.S.A. The intention is, under cover of the clamour about a military threat on the part of the Soviet Union, to raise taxes, to place fresh burdens upon the shoulders of the people, develop the war industry still more, in order to make greater profits. Why this? Why, things have now gone so far in the U.S.A. that they have begun to talk in the language of Hitler and Goering: less butter, more guns. And less butter and more guns means a blow at the budget of the work.ingman, office employee, of the worker in general. Why do this? The Soviet Union does not

threaten the U.S.A., we want to live not merely in peace, but in friendship. But that is up to you and, first of all, up to your government and the responsibility rests with it. We, on our part, will keep our armed forces in readiness to repel aggression.

Our main efforts will be directed towards winning the competition in developing the economy. At present, the Party and the Soviet Government are concentrating attention upon the further growth of our national economy, upon housing, increasing the output of consumer goods, in order to outstrip the United States of America in a short historical period. At present, in the U.S.A. the level of production is, of course, higher than in the Soviet Union, and that is quite understandable, for the United States of America embarked upon the path of industrial development considerably earlier than Russia. But now, after the October Revolution and the triumph of socialism, this gap between our countries is narrowing and the time is not far off when the Soviet Union will be in advance of the U.S.A. in economy and we shall ensure higher living standards for our people. And this will convince all people still more of the advantages of the socialist system over the capitalist system.

Considine: In the U.S.A. people are puzzled by the expression "adventurism in foreign policy" which was applied to Zhukov. I should like to ask what exactly "adventurism in foreign policy" means?

Khrushchov: The pursuance of an unrealistic foreign and home policy—that is adventurism. It should be read as it is written.

Considine: Were any definite countries meant, or any definite crises, as, for instance, in Syria or Hungary?

Khrushchov: Syria and Hungary bear no relation to the given case. That was not the policy of one man, that was the policy of the Soviet Government, including Comrade Zhukov, who stood on the same position.

Hearst: Mr. Khrushchov, in your interview given to Mr. Reston of *The New York Times* you said that you were in

possession of irrefutable proofs of the United States of America being engaged in inciting certain countries to an armed attack on Syria. Tell us, can you publish these proofs now? If so, we would very much like to be the first receivers of these proofs.

Khrushchov. If you are not in bad relations with Mr. President and Mr. Dulles, then ask them about these proofs, they can tell you everything, as they are well acquainted with all the facts of the case. And so are we. If you want to get the originals of these documents they will give them to you, if they want to, naturally if relations between you are confidential. We obtained this information at third and fourth hand.

In due time, we shall present these authentic proofs for history, we shall show how some people, holding high posts in the U.S.A., while calling upon God, do things which are contrary to the conscience of man, they were the ones who incited Turkey to war against Syria. Right now, we are not making this information public as it is unwise to deprive ourselves of such documents in the future. But history will certainly know about it. You may be sure of that.

Hearst: They have already denied it publicly, and Dulles, in particular, denied it in a private conversation with me.

Khrushchov: I read their public statements. But, you see, I am well aware that they are denying what is undeniable. Even if we were to give you the documents now, they would also deny it, for obvious reasons. The Turkish statesmen also know all about it, although they will deny it too. But, in their hearts, both the American and the Turkish statesmen admit that we have discovered their schemes, frustrated this villainous gamble which might have developed and cost humanity great losses. We are glad that this hotbed of war, which the imperialists wanted to nurse, is dying down.

Considine: Is the situation still tense in Syria?

Khrushchov: The tension has not yet been eliminated but we think that tension is decreasing, it is abating. Every-

thing depends upon the U.S.A., because it started the thing, and only when it saw to what it might lead did it change its plans. If the tension is removed, we shall be very happy.

Hearst: Mr Khrushchov, do you really and sincerely believe that the U.S.A. wants war?

Khrushchov: When we say the United States of America we have in mind certain circles in your country. If we are to speak of the American people, of the working people, of the larger majority of the intellectuals, then they, undoubtedly, are against war. If we are to speak of the bourgeoisie, then a considerable part of it does not want war either. War is wanted by the big monopolists who make profits from the armaments race and are doing their best in every way to fan the cold war, and the cold war, if it is not stopped, may sooner or later lead to a hot war. The policy of the armaments race and cold war is a very dangerous policy.

Hearst: I want to say in all sincerity that for the very same reasons for which you do not want war, because you are engaged in peaceful construction and war may lead to destruction, for these very same reasons no one in the U.S.A. wants war. We understand that war with the use of the A- and H-bombs will bring vast destruction. Literally everyone in the U.S.A. understands that: the President and Mr. Dulles, the capitalists and monopolists. You yourself said that the living standards in our country are higher than in yours, hence, we do not want war to a still greater extent, as we stand to lose more in that war. I am quite sure that not a single person in the United States of America wants war. I am just as firmly convinced of this as you are convinced when you say that you want peace.

Khrushchov: Then, what prevents us from coming to an agreement on stopping the cold war? Let us put an end to the cold war and bring about a relaxation of international tension. Instead of the cold war, it is better to traverse step

by step the road of establishing friendly relations between our countries

I want to recall certain definite proposals which the Soviet Government submitted with the aim of relieving tension and improving relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. About two years ago, the Soviet Government proposed to the United States Government to conclude a treaty on friendship and non-aggression between our countries. That would have been a good beginning, but the Government of the U.S.A. refused. Leading American statesmen explained this refusal by the fact that the U.S.A., if you please, belongs to the UNO which serves the aims of the struggle for peace. Yes, the UNO, which is called upon to serve these aims, does exist, but there also exist military blocs which serve other aims. One may ask, would such an agreement between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. have been contradictory to the aims and tasks of the UNO? Not at all. As we say, butter cannot spoil the porridge. If, in addition to the pledges which our countries have made under the UNO Charter, the governments of our countries were to make additional pledges with regard to each other, that would be useful for our peoples and for the peoples of the whole world.

We proposed to come to terms with the countries in the military blocs—NATO and the Warsaw Treaty—on a non-aggression agreement. This would also contribute to the elimination of tension in relations between countries, which could lead to a gradual elimination of the cold war and the establishment of normal relations between states. But this proposal, too, did not find any response on the part of the Western powers.

The renunciation of trade discrimination would also be an important step in improving relations. In other words, there are many possibilities which, together with a show of good will, could be utilized for the achievement of mutual understanding to live in peace and friendship without creating a military psychosis.

We have already said that the Soviet Union would like to have friendly relations with the United States of America. It is better to have peaceful competition than competition in the manufacture of means of destruction. The establishment of friendly relations between our countries would be a great step towards the consolidation of peace between all countries, towards the maintenance of world peace. We are fighting for peace and are bending all our efforts on the achievement of this goal.

Believe me, gentlemen, that we want only peace and friendship. The Soviet Union has intercontinental ballistic missiles with hydrogen warheads. But I have already stated on behalf of our Party and the Government of the Soviet Union, on behalf of the Soviet people, and I repeat now, that we shall never launch such a missile against the U.S.A. if the U.S.A. itself does not compel us to this by beginning a war against us directly or through its satellites. The Soviet Union will never resort to arms first, atomic and hydrogen weapons included, but will keep them to deal any aggressor an appropriate counter-blow.

But in peaceful competition we will work to win out. Here, if I may say so, the Soviet people will be on the offensive. But this will be an offensive in which people will not perish, but quite the contrary, they will be improving their life and raising the level of their economy and culture. Challenging the United States to a competition to produce more meat, butter, clothes, footwear, to build more good housing, to manufacture more TV and radio sets, vacuum cleaners and other goods and articles necessary to man, the Soviet people are confident in their victory. You are not being threatened with intercontinental ballistic missiles. You are threatened with a peaceful offensive, a peaceful competition in the manufacture of consumer goods and articles that serve to improve the culture and life of people. In this we will be relentless. This competition will show which system is better. I would like to make you,

Mr. Hearst, at least neutral in the struggle for peace
(*Laughter*)

Hearst: I am not bellicose, and never was. We are not official representatives of our country. We are only journalists. But I would like to say that we, accepting this challenge to compete on the peaceful front, on the front of improving the life of people, upon our return home will try to make it so that our country will officially accept this challenge.

Conniff: I try to follow all your speeches. I remember that you quoted Lenin as saying that the aim should be to retain by all means in the Party those comrades that have temporarily deviated from the Party line, if basically they remain good and honest people. The aim should be by all means to return these people back to the correct road. Would you say that this point of view could be applied to Marshal Zhukov?

Khrushchov: Marshal Zhukov was never expelled from the Party and remains a member of our Communist Party. He is a great military specialist, and we are sure that he will devote his strength and knowledge to the cause of our Party, to the cause of the people. The Party has punished him, but has punished him to the extent of his political mistakes which he himself admitted.

Considine: You said that in case of war, American bases both in the country and abroad will be demolished by Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles. Does this mean that already today they are specially trained on all these targets?

Khrushchov: This is a question for the Chief of the General Staff, as it lies outside the scope of my duties. That's what the General Staff exists for, to be ready in case of war to hit those centres which are decisive for the speedy ending of the war, for defeating the enemy.

In connection with this I would like to express my views with regard to statements made by certain representatives of military circles and published in the press. It was re-

ported that a part of the American bomber force, with hydrogen and atomic bombs, were constantly in the air and always ready to strike against the Soviet Union. Reports have it that one half of the planes are in the air.

This is very dangerous. Such a situation serves as an illustration of the extent of the war psychosis in the U.S.A. When planes with hydrogen bombs take off that means that many people will be in the air piloting them. There is always the possibility of a mental blackout when the pilot may take the slightest signal as a signal for action and fly to the target that he had been instructed to fly to. Under such conditions a war may start purely by chance, since immediately retaliatory action would be taken.

Does this not go to show that in such a case a war may start as a result of a sheer misunderstanding or of a derangement in the normal psychic state of a person, which may happen to anybody? Such a horrible possibility must be excluded. It may be that both sides will be against war, and yet war may still start as a result of the war psychosis whipped up in the United States of America.

Hearst: That is a very interesting idea. I had not heard of such things. I personally am not a military man, but I do not think that half of our planes are in the air. Mr. Considine here suggests that it may be one-third.

Khrushchov: Even if only one plane with one atomic or one hydrogen bomb were in the air, it would be not the government but the pilot who could decide the question of war. And this, as you may imagine, would be a terrible thing.

Hearst: That is a very interesting thought.

Considine: Mr. Khrushchov, the Soviet Earth satellites have created a tremendous impression in America. This is really a marvelous, fantastic achievement. But at present the International Geophysical Year is on, during which it is planned that there will be a mutual exchange of various information. We would like to ask whether Russia would help

America in the launching of a satellite. Is she ready to supply the data?

Khrushchov: With pleasure.

Considine: And would that include also data on the nature of the rocket that carried this satellite, data on the powerful fuel that was used?

Khrushchov: Of course, if we come to an agreement on disarmament. We do not conceal that the satellite was launched on the basis of an intercontinental ballistic rocket. You realize what this would mean if we shared with you the secret of the manufacture of intercontinental ballistic rockets. We do not know when the U.S.A. will produce such a rocket; after all, it is not an easy thing. I even allow for the possibility that the United States of America may not produce an intercontinental rocket for some time yet. But we can disclose the secret of the manufacture of such rockets only under such conditions when you will stop the cold war and our countries will compete only in peaceful fields.

The fact that the Soviet Union was the first to launch an artificial Earth satellite, which within a month was followed by another one, says much. If necessary, tomorrow we can launch ten or twenty satellites. All that is required for this is to replace the warhead of an intercontinental ballistic rocket with the necessary instruments, and launch the whole thing with the instruments. There's a satellite for you.

The Soviet Union is ready to share with the United States of America information in this field, to show and, more than that, together with you to sink all ballistic missiles in the seas so as to secure a strong and lasting peace between our countries, and, consequently, in the whole world. But all this is on condition of disarmament, on condition of peaceful competition between our countries, on condition of peaceful coexistence of all countries, irrespective of their social or political systems.

Hearst: I read your very interesting proposal to compete in rocket shooting. This would be very well when we have

such rockets. We'll compete, and then we can throw them out.

Khrushchov: We are also for this, it would be good to do the latter—throw them out—quicker. (*Laughter.*)

Hearst: You, most likely, are impatiently waiting for us to solve the first part and produce the rockets.

Khrushchov: I think that finally you will produce an intercontinental rocket, although, I repeat, it is not an easy job. The United States of America possesses the necessary knowledge and can produce such a rocket But when, I cannot say.

Hearst: I mentioned that merely as a joke.

Khrushchov: The Americans thought that we were incapable of producing an intercontinental ballistic rocket and they lost in this matter.

Hearst: That's true.

Khrushchov: We did not and do not say such things with regard to Americans. But the fact remains that the Soviet Union was the first to produce an intercontinental rocket. This means that we are ahead and gives us the possibility to improve the production of rockets, to lead the U.S.A. in this matter, and to accumulate the necessary stocks of rockets if we do not come to terms on disarmament

Considine: Mr. Khrushchov, your relations with Poland and Yugoslavia were satisfactorily resolved and now each country is going its own way to socialism. Do you not consider that proceeding precisely from this the situation in Hungary could have been resolved without the use of armed forces?

Khrushchov: Yes, it could. But the course of events there took a somewhat different turn. The imperialists engineered a plot against people's Hungary. Fascist-like cut-throats, most of whom had been sent in from abroad, began to exterminate progressive people. The Government of Hungary asked the Government of the Soviet Union for help in curbing the counter-revolutionary gangs. And the Soviet Union, true to its commitments, true to the principles of

fraternal support to socialist countries, rendered such aid. And today socialist Hungary is steadily growing and developing. The events in Hungary must serve as a lesson for the reactionary forces, so that they, as a Russian proverb puts it, should not plunge into the river without first finding the ford.

I would like to return to the question of relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. Recently I read the address of the President of the United States of America, Mr. Eisenhower, in Oklahoma City. I liked some of the ideas expressed in this address. I would like to recall to you some of the President's words. "The goal we seek," he said, "is peace with justice. . ." We also stand for this. "This," Mr. Eisenhower went on to say, "can come to our nation only as it comes to all. . ." We are for this too. We are for peace not only for us but for all countries, for the whole of mankind.

Mr. Eisenhower continued further: "The world's hope is that the Soviet will cooperate with all the rest of us in achieving this goal. . ." The President may rest assured that on our part we shall make all efforts to cooperate with all countries, the U.S.A. included, to maintain peace. "We will never be an aggressor," the President said. This is well said. "We want adequate security. We want no more than adequacy. We will accept nothing less," Mr. Eisenhower stated. The Soviet Union also agrees that security must be minded, but this question requires a judicious approach, so that such a desire would not lead to an arms race, as the case is today. History has already shown that any arms race in the long run ends in war. That is why the arms race must be stopped so as to preclude the possibility of a war being provoked, and we believe the President of the U.S.A. does not want a war to be provoked either.

"It has always been my faith," Mr. Eisenhower said, "that the eventual triumph of decency and freedom in this world is inevitable. But, as a wise American once observed, it takes a lot of hard work and sacrifice by a lot of people

to bring about the inevitable." This is rather vague, because these words can be interpreted in different ways. But I want to believe that it has been said in the sense that the President wants to work towards ensuring universal peace. If it is so and the U.S.A. will really never be an aggressor, as Mr. Eisenhower says—and the Soviet Union, of course, will never be one—then let us agree on the discontinuation of the arms race. If we attain this, all mankind will heave a sigh of relief. Such a step would be beneficial not only to the peoples of our countries but also to all the peoples of the world.

I would like you to make this viewpoint of ours known to the public of the U.S.A. and bring it to the knowledge of the President.

I recall the pleasant conversations we had with the U.S. President in Geneva. I remember Mr. Eisenhower, when he arranged a lunch for our delegation, speaking with animation about his farm and saying, in particular, that it had no small achievements to its credit in getting, through hybridization, a good breed of cattle. It would be much better for us to compete in this field than in stockpiling arms.

Or let us, for instance, compete in the output of corn. I have talked much on this subject with the American expert, Mr. Garst, and he presented me with a sample of his corn. It is much more pleasant to talk about corn than about the intercontinental missile. The American public and press can do a good turn to the peoples if they promote competition precisely in this peaceful direction.

Conniff: I would like to ask, although I know that Communist leaders usually are not disposed to speak about themselves personally, what the Communist Party has been to you all your life and what it is to you now in the plane of personal feelings

Khrushchov: The Communist Party is dear to me in that it expresses the interests of the working class, the interests of the people, and my aspirations and dreams of building a new society. I am happy that, having lived for many

years and worked in this Party for a long time, I can state that our Communist Party, proceeding along the path outlined by Lenin, has ensured such a colossal progress of our country, and that our people have blazed the trail now followed by many peoples of other countries.

As all Communists, I dream only of ensuring a happy life for all people, of ensuring that all people, irrespective of nationality, irrespective of religion, irrespective of the colour of their skin, fully enjoy the benefits of their labour. We are working to accumulate as much material wealth as would provide for all abundance. And we believe that mankind will attain this. One cannot foretell exactly when it will come about, but what is clear is that mankind is advancing towards it. I rejoice at this, and, for my part, am doing everything in my power to promote this advance.

If you, gentlemen, representatives of the capitalist world, understood what communism is, for what lofty ideals the Communists are fighting, you should be ashamed to abuse the Communists. Many people still do not understand the lofty task facing the Communists. This task is to ensure full freedom for man, to ensure an unheard-of growth of productive forces and social wealth, the development of the material and spiritual forces of the peoples, the blossoming of culture.

I would like to say a few words more, and then, perhaps, it will be time to conclude our protracted talk with this. We have trade unions here, I am a member of one, and it is bound to protect me, for I find myself being exploited by American capitalists. (*Laughter.*)

In conclusion, I have to say the following. We do not want to impose our ideas on any people by any means of coercion and most certainly not by war. People can accept the Communist outlook only of their own free will. The people of each country should themselves determine the course along which they will develop. And if the peoples do not want to develop along the road of socialism, then nobody can or should impose this road by force.

We have declared repeatedly that the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of all countries, irrespective of their social system or state structure, is the unshakeable foundation of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. We are convinced that all countries must and can coexist in peace. How every country will develop is the internal affair of the people of that country. Both the socialist and capitalist countries exist on one planet. They have multiple contacts in the sphere of economy, culture, transportation and so on. These countries can live in peace only on the basis of peaceful coexistence, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

The Soviet Union has never taken up, and it will never take up, arms against any other country for the purpose of imposing its ideology, its system upon the people of that country. This is alien to the very essence of our Marxist-Leninist outlook. Therefore we sincerely say that we want to live in peace and friendship with all peoples and we would be very glad if we were to succeed in establishing friendly relations with the United States of America not to the detriment of its relations with other countries. This would make it possible to take literally seven-league strides along the road of abolishing the cold war and establishing friendship with the peoples of all countries. We want to set up good, friendly relations with Great Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, with all the countries with which we still do not have such relations. This would ensure a stable peace throughout the world.

Considine: Mr. Khrushchov, you referred to God, to the soul, to the absolute spiritual freedom of man under communism, but then why does a man who believes in God, in man's inner spiritual content, find no place in the Communist Party?

Khrushchov: If, in our speech, we use such expressions as, for instance, "God's truth," this happens only by virtue of habit. To us, such an expression is equivalent to the phrase, "Upon my word of honour." We consider that belief

in God contradicts our Communist outlook. We, however, by no means persecute people professing a religion, for this is a matter of every man's conscience.

In the Soviet Union, the church has been separated from the state. But you probably know that there are many churches in our country, and every one of them has full freedom of action if it does not interfere in the political life of the state. If clergymen start combining their religious activities with political propaganda against the Soviet system, this will be a violation of our Constitution. And the Soviet people will not tolerate this interference of the church in the affairs of their state.

In a word, we will not go to war for the tomb of the Saviour. One should not fight for a tomb to strew the world with other tombs. Once, bloody wars were fought for the tomb of the Saviour, thousands upon thousands of people perished in crusades. But these times have long since become history.

Hearst: I would like to say, not as an objection but just as a remark, that still there has never been a civilization in history or a great country which did not believe in some God or other.

Khrushchov: I must say, as a matter of elucidation, that there has never been a country where all people believed in religion alone, where all of them believed in God. We, too, still have people who believe in God. So let them believe. To believe or not to believe in God is a personal affair of every individual, a matter of his conscience. All this, however, does not prevent Soviet people from living in peace and friendship. And it often happens that there are believers and atheists in one family. But those who believe in God are becoming fewer and fewer—young people are growing up, and they, in their overwhelming majority, do not believe in God. Public education, the dissemination of scientific knowledge, the study of the laws of nature leave no place for belief in God.

Hearst: I only want to say that therein, possibly, lies one of the reasons why we do not always reach agreement with each other. The thing is, perhaps, that when we give our word, calling upon God, we assume a spiritual pledge, while in the case of Russia, agreements remain on paper only. I do not know, but maybe some day we will manage to overcome all these differences.

Khrushchov: In reply to this, I would like to say the following: we Communists, the Soviet politicians, are atheists. But we set high value on our pledges, on our word, and we never break our pledges. We value the life of man and devote all our efforts to ensuring that the people of our country have a good, happy life, that all Soviet people be equal in their rights and duties, that they have all the possibilities for enjoying the fruits of their labour. We Communists are fighting actively to prevent war, are doing everything that there be no new war. Now, take Mr. Dulles, for instance. He is a religious man and very often he appeals to God, calling upon him as witness. So, appealing to God, Mr. Dulles sends his emissary, Mr. Henderson, to Turkey and other countries to engineer war, to organize the killing of people. How can this be compatible with the conception of belief in God? No religion will bless such actions. This is where the discrepancy lies. Such people seek to present the matter as if in their activities they really proceed from "divine commands," while, in fact, they engage in activities contradicting the very principles of humaneness, and, consequently, the whole of human society.

How can one hold services and sprinkle holy water on the weapons designed for the destruction of man, give blessing to people sent to kill other people only because these people speak a different language or profess a different faith? But this is done by some priests. Can you call it the supreme spiritual manifestation of humaneness and integrity? No, it is a mask. God is often invoked as a camouflage in order to deceive people by playing on the feelings of believers. But this is nothing but pharisaism. There are many

people who use the name of God to cover their criminal anti-social deeds. And we shall always fight against such people, unmask their activities, show the people true ways of moral and spiritual emancipation. Victory in this struggle will be on the side of our, socialist, order. And you will never set the American people against us on the ground that we are atheists. As soon as they realize the loftiness of our aims, of our actions, they will turn with contempt from those who want to set them against us and push them to a new war which will cost mankind much blood and tremendous losses.

I recall a story I once read, about robbers who killed and robbed a man. In the plunder they found a chunk of fresh ham. After a time the robbers decided to take a rest and eat the ham. They had already started distributing it among themselves when one of them asked: What day of the week is it today? He was told it was Wednesday or Friday. (I can't remember the exact day in the story.) Then he declared that they should not eat the ham, for the Orthodox Church prohibited meat on Wednesdays and Fridays. You see how it is—the robbers killed a man, took his life, everything he had, but did not eat the ham taken from the plunder for fear of committing a sin, because it is said to be forbidden by God to eat animal food on that day.

Is it not that the deeds of certain Western statesmen remind one of this sacrilegious conduct of the people described in this story? For they, shielding themselves by the name of God, quite often do things which bring death to thousands and millions of people.

In their day, in pursuit of gain, the colonialists never failed to send to the countries they enslaved, together with troops, their priests and, so to speak, conquered the peoples with the sword and the cross. They brought to enslaved countries the cross and the Gospel, they forced their religion upon the people. They left the Gospel to the people and took the riches for themselves. The whole world knows about this sacrilege, about this deception. So you better do not

speaking about how religion was implanted in the people, do not appeal to God for help in the struggle against the exploited and oppressed people. All these are methods already experienced by, and known to, the working people.

Considine: Last year in Melbourne I witnessed the brilliant victory of the Soviet athletes at the Olympic Games. This victory came as a surprise to many, and especially to us Americans, who have grown accustomed to the United States winning at these competitions. In this connection I would like to ask whether you think of suggesting Moscow as the Olympic site for, say, 1964, all the more so since there is an excellent new stadium in Moscow.

Khrushchov: And have you seen our stadium in Luzhniki?

Conniff: Yes, we have visited it, and it is truly a magnificent structure. At the time of our visit here three years ago there was nothing but a few little old houses in the place where the stadium stands now. And now the area looks quite different.

Khrushchov: Yes, the numerous facilities of the stadium were built in only eighteen months, and, in the opinion of our specialists, they are suitable for holding Olympic Games. We will be happy to play host to participants in the Olympic Games.

And I must say, we in the Soviet Union receive many guests from all the countries of the world, including the U.S.A. Our doors are open hospitably to all people of good will, which cannot be said about the U.S.A., where the American authorities are apparently afraid to let Soviet citizens enter.

Hearst, Conniff and Considine thanked Khrushchov for the interview.

Pravda, November 29, 1957

**N. S. KHRUSHCHOV'S REPLY
TO AN OPEN LETTER
BY THE BRITISH PHILOSOPHER,
BERTRAND RUSSELL**

Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher, addressed an open letter to N. S. Khrushchov and Dwight D. Eisenhower, which was printed in the *New Statesman* of November 23, 1957.

On December 9, N. S. Khrushchov sent to the Editor of that journal a reply to the open letter by Bertrand Russell. It was printed on December 21, 1957.

We give here the texts of both letters.

**OPEN LETTER
FROM BERTRAND RUSSELL
TO N. S. KHRUSHCHOV
AND DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER**

Most Potent Sirs,

I am addressing you as the respective heads of the two most powerful countries in the world. Those who direct the policies of these countries have a power for good or evil exceeding anything ever possessed before by any man or group of men. Public opinion in your respective countries has been focused upon the points in which your national interests are thought to diverge, but I am convinced that you, as farseeing and intelligent men, must be aware that the matters in which the interests of Russia and America coincide are much more important than the matters in which they are thought to diverge.

I believe that if you two eminent men were jointly to proclaim this fact and to bend the policies of your great countries to agreement with such proclamation, there would be throughout the world, and not least in your own countries, a shout of joyful agreement which would raise you both to a pinnacle of fame surpassing anything achieved by other statesmen of the past or present. Although you are, of course, both well aware of the points in which the interests of Russia and America are identical, I will, for the sake of explicitness, enumerate some of them.

1) The supreme concern of men of all ways of thought at the present time must be to ensure the continued existence of the human race. This is already in jeopardy from the hostility between East and West and will, if many minor nations acquire nuclear weapons, be in very much greater jeopardy within a few years from the possibility of irresponsible action by thoughtless fanatics.

Some ignorant militarists, both in the East and in the West, have apparently thought that the danger could be averted by a world war giving victory to their own side. The progress of science and technology has made this an idle dream.

A world war would not result in the victory of either side, but in the extermination of both. Neither side can desire such a cataclysm.

The hope of world dominion, either military or ideological, is one which has hovered before many men in the past and had led invariably to disaster. Philip II of Spain made the attempt and reduced his country to the status of a minor Power. Louis XIV of France made the attempt and, by exhausting his country, led the way to the French Revolution, which he would have profoundly deplored. Hitler, in our own day, fought for the world-wide supremacy of the Nazi philosophy, and perished miserably. Two great men propounded ideologies which have not yet run their course. I mean the authors of the Declaration of Independence and the Communist Manifesto. There is no reason to expect that either of these ideologies will be more successful in conquering the world than their predecessors, Buddhist, Christian, Moslem, or Nazi. What is new in the present situation is not the impossibility of success, but the magnitude of the disaster which must result from the attempt. We must, therefore, hope that each side will abandon the futile strife and agree to allow to each a sphere proportionate to its present power.

2) The international anarchy which will inevitably result from the unrestricted diffusion of nuclear weapons is not to the interest of either Russia or America. There was a time when only America had nuclear weapons. This was followed by a time when only Russia and America had such weapons. And now only Russia, America and Britain possess them. It is obvious that, unless steps are taken, France and Germany will shortly manufacture these weapons. It is not likely

that China will lag far behind. We must expect that during the next few years the manufacture of engines of mass destruction will become cheaper and easier. No doubt Egypt and Israel will then be able to follow the example set by the Great Powers. So will the states of South America. There is no end to this process until every sovereign state is in a position to say to the whole world, "You must yield to my demands or you shall die." If all sovereign states were governed by rulers possessed of even the rudiments of sanity, they would be restrained from such blackmail by the fear that their citizens also would perish. But experience shows that from time to time power in this or that country falls into the hands of rulers who are not sane. Can anyone doubt that Hitler, if he had been able to do so, would have chosen to involve all mankind in his own ruin? For such reasons, it is imperative to put a stop to the diffusion of nuclear weapons. This can easily be done by agreement between Russia and America, since they can jointly refuse military or economic assistance to any country other than themselves which persists in the manufacture of such weapons. But it cannot be achieved without agreement between the two dominant Powers, for, without such agreement, each new force of nuclear weapons will be welcomed by one side or the other as an increase to its own strength. This helter-skelter race towards ruin must be stopped if anything that anybody could desire is to be effected.

3) So long as the fear of world war dominates policy and the only deterrent is the threat of universal death, so long there can be no limit to the diversion of expenditure of funds and human energy into channels of destruction. It is clear that both Russia and America could save nine-tenths of their present expenditure if they concluded an alliance and devoted themselves jointly to the preservation of peace throughout the world. If they do not find means of lessening their present hostility, reciprocal fear will drive them further and further, until, apart from immense armaments, nothing beyond a bare subsistence will be left to the populations of either country. In order to promote efficiency in the preparation of death, education will have to be distorted and stunted. Everything in human achievement that is not inspired by hatred and fear will be squeezed out of the curriculum in schools and universities. Any attempt to preserve the vision of Man as the triumph (so far) of the long ages of evolution, will come to be viewed as treachery, since it will be thought not to minister to the victory of this group or that. Such a prospect is death to the hopes of all who share the aspirations which have inspired human progress since the dawn of history.

4) I cannot but think that you would both rejoice if a way could be found to disperse the pall of fear which at present dims the hopes of mankind. Never before, since our remote ancestors descended from the trees, has there been valid reason for such fear. Never before has

such a sense of futility blighted the visions of youth. Never before has there been reason to feel that the human race was travelling along a road ending only in a bottomless precipice. Individual death we must all face, but collective death has never hitherto been a grim possibility.

And all this fear, all this despair, all this waste is utterly unnecessary. One thing only is required to dispel the darkness and enable the world to live again in a noonday brightness of hope. The one thing necessary is that East and West should recognize their respective rights, admit that each must learn to live with the other and substitute argument for force in the attempt to spread their respective ideologies. It is not necessary that either side should abandon belief in its own creed. It is only necessary that it should abandon the attempt to spread its own creed by force of arms.

I suggest, Sirs, that you should meet in a frank discussion of the conditions of coexistence, endeavouring no longer to secure this or that more or less surreptitious advantage for your own side, but seeking rather for such agreements and such adjustments in the world as will diminish future occasions of strife. I believe that if you were to do this the world would acclaim your action, and the forces of sanity, released from their long bondage, would ensure for the years to come a life of vigour and achievement and joy surpassing anything known in even the happiest eras of the past.

BERTRAND RUSSELL

MR. KINGSLEY MARTIN,
EDITOR, *NEW STATESMAN*

Dear Mr. Editor, in connection with the open letter of Prof. Bertrand Russell, addressed to President Eisenhower and myself, I would like to express some views on the questions it raises.

I shall be grateful for the opportunity to publish my reply to this letter in the next issue of your journal.

Yours sincerely,
N. KHRUSHCHOV

December 7, 1957

**N. S. KHRUSHCHOV'S REPLY
TO THE LETTER
BY BERTRAND RUSSELL**

Dear Lord Russell, I was extremely interested to read your open letter addressed to the President of the United States and to myself. In your letter you touched on the most essential questions of the present international situation, which have for a long time been a matter of deep concern to people throughout the world. We Soviet people understand and hold dear the main idea expressed in your letter—to protect mankind from the threat of a war with the use of the most terrible weapons of destruction ever known to the world, to safeguard universal peace and prosperity—on the basis of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, and, above all, through the normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Everyone is agreed that if a new world war should break out, it would bring untold suffering to the people. For this reason the chief concern of all people, whatsoever their way of thinking, should be to prevent such a tragic turn of events. Man's reason and conscience cannot be reconciled to such a danger, cannot but rise up against the propaganda churned out day after day, propaganda which is accustoming the nations to the idea of the inevitability of atomic war.

The Government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union, expressing the wishes of the peoples of our country, are doing and will do everything possible to prevent the outbreak of a new war. We are convinced that, in the present situation, war is not fatally inevitable, that war can be prevented, if everyone who wants to preserve peace will struggle for it actively and in an organized way.

We were pleased to note that you support the ending of the arms race which only brings nearer the catastrophe of war. You appeal for an end to the diffusion of nuclear weapons, so that the armies of those states which at the pres-

ent time do not yet possess such weapons will not receive them. Of course, this would be a step forward, especially if you take into account the fact that there exist plans for handing over nuclear weapons to—for example—West Germany, whose Government openly stakes its territorial claims in Europe, and the fact that nuclear weapons, brought in from across the ocean, are being deployed on the territories of West European member-states of NATO. These weapons are imposed on these states under the guise of defence against aggression. In reality, the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territories of those countries is a grave menace to their security, since, if an aggressor breaks the peace, then, in accordance with the inexorable logic of war, shattering retaliatory attacks on the territories of those countries in which atomic weapon bases are situated will be inevitable.

You certainly know that the Soviet Union has frequently come out with a proposal that nuclear weapons should not be deployed beyond the state frontiers of those countries which possess them already, and that, in particular, it has also proposed that the U.S.A., Britain and the U.S.S.R. should reach an agreement not to deploy their nuclear weapons in either West or East Germany. For its part, the Government of the German Democratic Republic has proposed to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that they act together so that there shall be neither German nor foreign nuclear weapons on German territory. The Polish and Czechoslovak governments have announced that if agreement is reached between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, then, similarly, neither Poland nor Czechoslovakia would produce nuclear weapons or deploy them on their territory. As you can see, the socialist states are doing everything in their power to prevent further distribution of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, this has not yet met with a response from the Western powers. On the contrary, the two other Powers in possession of nuclear weapons—the U.S.A. and Britain—are

taking every possible step to involve their North Atlantic bloc partners still more deeply in the preparations for atomic war

However, even if we succeeded in preventing the further diffusion of nuclear weapons in the world, all this would by no means remove the danger of nuclear war. For, even now, when only three powers have nuclear weapons, this danger is very great. The Soviet Union considers that the danger of atomic war will only be removed finally and completely when the manufacture and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons will have been completely prohibited and the stockpiles destroyed. For almost 12 years now the Soviet Government has been demanding such a solution of this question and has made quite a few concrete proposals in the UN in support of these aims. If the Western powers would express a sincere desire to end the danger of atomic war, then it would be possible—tomorrow, even—to advance along this path, taking, for a start, such steps as the immediate ending of nuclear weapon tests and renunciation of the use of such weapons. But it must be said straight out that, up to the present, unfortunately, we have not had evidence of any such desire on the part of the American, British or French governments. The fact is that the quarters which formulate the policies of those countries wish to preserve war in their arsenal as a means of securing the aims of their foreign policy.

We Soviet people, engaged in building communist society—a social system in which, alongside the achievement of material abundance for all, there will for the first time be free development of man's spiritual wealth in all its diversity—we understand particularly well your concern over the criminal policy of militarism, which absurdly wastes society's material resources, which corrupts man morally and which leads to people being brought up in the spirit of fear and hate. It is impossible to be reconciled to such a prospect—all the more so when the wonderful discoveries of science have given man such immense

power over the forces of Nature. Now there really are no limits to the possibilities of harnessing Nature's elemental forces, or of using natural resources to ensure the prosperity of all peoples, on the basis of friendly cooperation among the nations.

As a philosopher and humanist, deeply concerned at the abnormality of the present international situation, you understand very well along what lines solution of the present situation must be sought. "The one thing necessary," you write, "is that East and West should recognize their respective rights, admit that each must learn to live with the other and substitute argument for force in the attempt to spread their respective ideologies. It is not necessary that either side should abandon belief in its own creed. It is only necessary that it should abandon the attempt to spread its own creed by force of arms."

I am ready to lend my name to those words, since they correspond fully to the conception of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, upon which our state has based its foreign policy since the first day of the establishment of Soviet power. There is no need to say how glad I would be to hear that your words had met with similar support from the U.S. Government.

In order to "live with the other"—that is, in order to ensure peaceful coexistence—both sides must recognize what politicians call the status quo, must recognize the existing state of affairs. The right of each country to develop as the people of that country desire must be recognized. The conduct of cold war, engaging in threats, attempts to change state frontiers and interference in other countries' domestic affairs with the aim of altering their social structure—these things must not be permitted. Cold war and the arms drive will lead to a new and very bloody war.

You are perfectly right, of course, when you say that one of the chief reasons for the present state of tension in international relations, and for all that is meant by

cold war, is the abnormal character of the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. The normalization of these relations, on the rational basis of peaceful coexistence and respect for one another's rights and interests, would beyond doubt lead to a general improvement in the international situation. The Soviet Union has always sought just such a normalization of relations with the United States, and it will continue to do so. We have taken quite a few definite steps in this direction. You will probably remember, for example, that in January 1956 the Soviet Government proposed to the Government of the U.S.A. that a treaty of friendship and cooperation be concluded between our two countries. Our proposal still holds good. We have tried and will continue to try to re-establish Soviet-American trade relations, which were broken off by the Government of the U.S.A., and we want to open up cultural, scientific and technical exchanges with the United States. Negotiations are now, incidentally, taking place in Washington on Soviet initiative for the widening of cultural relations between our two countries.

The Soviet leaders have always believed, and still do believe, that personal contacts with government leaders of other countries are of very great importance, as one of the most effective ways of improving international relations. We readily took part in the Geneva Conference of Heads of Government, and, as you are no doubt aware, we have also met the government leaders of many other countries. Such meetings, and the Geneva Conference in particular, definitely helped bring about an improvement in the international situation.

I fully support your proposal, Lord Russell, that the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States should meet and frankly discuss conditions of coexistence. Like you, we are convinced that there are far more matters in which the interests of the Soviet Union and the United States coincide than there are matters in which our interests diverge. This, precisely, is why on the Soviet side

the opinion has been repeatedly expressed that a high-level meeting between representatives of the U.S.S.R. and the United States would be most useful for both our countries, as well as for peace among all nations

We have, of course, no intention or wish whatsoever to reach agreement with the United States at the expense of the interests of any other state, of West or East, large or small, or at the cost of a deterioration in the United States' relations with any other country. On the contrary, we consider that an improvement in Soviet-American relations could only be of use, and that no one would lose by it.

We favour a meeting between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union. It depends, therefore, on the leaders of the United States whether or not such a meeting will take place. We know that there are forces, both in the United States itself and outside it, which fear improvement in relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., and which actively oppose any step in that direction. Those forces base their policy on exploiting the distrust and differences existing at present between the two biggest Powers, and they are doing everything they can to exacerbate these differences and to use them for their own selfish purposes. Is there any need to point out that this policy is against the interests of strengthening peace, against the interests of all peoples?

There can be no doubt that the easing of tension in international relations does not depend on the U.S.S.R. and the United States alone. Other countries too, including, of course, Great Britain, must make their contribution to it. Unfortunately, it cannot be said that the present policy of the British Government has been helpful in solving this most important task. It can hardly be denied that the transformation of Britain into an American base for nuclear and rocket weapons will bring no good either to world peace or to Britain's own security. In the relatively small area of the British Isles many United States military bases,

bases at which stocks of atomic and hydrogen bombs are stored, are already deployed, and a proposal is now being made to build launching sites for American rockets there. All the indications are that Britain is being more or less given the role of the main American medium-range rocket base in Europe I may be permitted to ask—what assurance can anyone have that the latest weapons, deployed on American bases in Britain, will not be used at the discretion of the American military command, without the knowledge of the British people, Parliament or even Government?

Isn't a situation being created whereby Britain may become the springboard for the unleashing of war against the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries? Just suppose that, by the merest chance—say, for instance, as the result of an incorrectly understood order—death-dealing weapons of war are used from American military bases in your country against the peace-loving countries. A crushing retaliatory blow would follow immediately. In such an event, the British people might find themselves suddenly in a situation of atomic war, a situation in which Britain's very existence would be threatened. Believe me, I am not saying this with the object of frightening your fellow-countrymen. We have a great respect for your people, and would like to strengthen the friendliest relations with your country. I say this because I know the power of modern means of warfare. No wonder millions of British people feel legitimate anxiety and disquiet over the establishment of such bases on the territory of their country.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it advocates joint efforts by countries to ease international tension. This object could be served both by a meeting of representatives of the two Powers, the U.S.S.R. and the United States, and by a wider meeting of representatives of the capitalist and socialist countries.

The situation in the world today is so serious that anyone who can do anything to ease the war danger, to remove

the threat of war, must do what he can. The British people, who displayed such courage in the struggle against our common enemy during the Second World War, could make a substantial contribution to the preservation and strengthening of peace. The louder the voice of the peoples is raised in the struggle for peace, the smaller will be the chance the adherents of military adventures have to unleash a new war.

I am confident that your call for united efforts by the U.S.S.R. and the United States to strengthen peace, on the basis of peaceful coexistence, will meet with sympathetic response and support from all who cherish peace.

Your letter is a call to action in the struggle for peace. I permit myself the liberty of expressing the hope that this call will multiply the number of fighters for peace in Britain and in other countries of the world.

Fully supporting this call, my colleagues and I would like to express the hope that your ardent desire for improved relations between states will meet with support also from the leaders of other countries.

Today the struggle for peace, for the ending of the cold war, which sharpens international tension and which could lead mankind to immense disasters, the struggle for the peaceful coexistence of states, is the vital concern of all peoples of the world, of all men of good will. What we advocate is that the superiority of any particular system be proved, not on the field of battle, but in peaceful competition for progress, for improved living standards of the people.

Yours sincerely,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

December 7, 1957

International Affairs, No 1, 1958

**INTERVIEW GIVEN TO E. PICKERING,
EDITOR OF *DAILY EXPRESS***

December 19, 1957

On December 19, N. S. Khrushchov received Mr. E. Pickering, Editor of the *Daily Express* (London), who had requested an interview. Pickering was accompanied by Mr. Lancaster, a fellow-journalist. The answers to Mr. Pickering's questions are given below.

Pickering. Mr. Khrushchov, you have several times spoken as if you thought that the next few years would show an improvement in relations between Britain and the Soviet Union. Are you disappointed with the progress which has been made?

Khrushchov. I would say, there is no disappointment, but neither is there particular joy. The question of improving relations between our two countries is somewhat frozen. I think there is some kind of artificial reason for this. The peoples and the Government of the Soviet Union and, as we are convinced, the British people, all desire that relations of confidence and friendship be established between our two countries. I assume that the British Government also realizes the need for better relations. And we believe that ultimately the difficulties which evidently still hinder the British Government from taking more decisive steps in this direction will be overcome. The interests of our two countries and the interests of our peoples demand a rapprochement and friendship between them.

Pickering: Preliminary reports from the NATO Council meeting in Paris mention the possibility of new negotiations with the Soviet Union. What, in your opinion, would be the outcome of such talks if they took place in the near future?

Khrushchov. We have repeatedly spoken about the need for talks, because the present state of relations between countries, including those in Europe, is unsatisfactory. The tense international climate prevents people from living and working calmly, it makes them nervous. The arms drive weighs heavily on the national economies and, consequently, also on the peoples of Europe and other parts of the world. That is why we think that negotiations would be useful.

What aims should these negotiations have? They should have the basic aim of liquidating the cold war, lifting from the backs of the people the burden of the arms drive, creating normal living conditions for the people and improving relations between states. We have said more than once that all disputes must be settled through negotiation. For our part, we are always ready to do so. But the results of negotiations will be positive only if the Western powers proceed at the negotiations from recognition of the necessity of peaceful coexistence between countries, irrespective of their social system, from recognition of the status quo, i.e., the existing world situation, if they strive to end the cold war and normalize the international climate.

We know that in the West there are leaders who allege that it is impossible to reach understanding with representatives of the Soviet Union and that it is even impossible to believe them. But those who say this are, strictly speaking, those who do not want to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union. If at such talks leaders of this type try to obtain political concessions—and they understand political concessions to mean almost the liquidation of the Soviet system in the U.S.S.R., the liquidation of the economic and social gains achieved in the People's Democracies where people are building their lives on socialist princi-

ples—then, of course, the negotiations will not be successful. If the Western representatives have the sense not to make such demands and if, I repeat, they start by recognizing the necessity for peaceful coexistence and the status quo, then there is no reason which would prevent positive results.

Here I would like to mention Germany because the German problem has direct bearing on the question of recognizing the status quo. If the question of Germany continues to be posed as it is now by some Western leaders—that is, taking into account only the interests of West Germany and with no regard to the interests of East Germany—then no agreement can be reached on this basis. If the status quo is accepted and the acceptance of the status quo in the German issue means taking into account the existence of two Germanies (the Democratic Republic, a state developing on socialist lines, and the Federal Republic, a capitalist state), then conditions could be created in which the German problem could be solved. The Germans themselves should negotiate the terms of the peaceful reunification of Germany. At present they cannot agree on unification because the two Germanies have different state systems. But as a first step they could establish, as the G D R Government suggests, a confederation and form some all-German state bodies. Then the Germans themselves would take care of further deepening and strengthening the relations between East and West Germany.

These, then, are some of the problems on which the Western powers confront us with demands from “positions of strength”—demands which are utterly unacceptable. As for other problems, it also seems to me that it would be possible to tackle them in a spirit of common interest, renouncing policies of ultimatum and *diktat*.

Pickering: There have been recent signs of willingness in Britain to contemplate a situation in Europe where all Germany is neutralized and denied atomic weapons. Do you think this would be a hopeful line for our two countries to explore?

Khrushchov. We consider that the realization of such wishes would be useful for the peoples of Europe. The Soviet Union would gladly take part in a positive solution of this problem.

Pickering: Now allow me to come back to Anglo-Soviet relations. What single action by the British Government would in your view most contribute towards a better feeling between our two nations?

Khrushchov. When the Government Delegation of the Soviet Union was in Britain, N. A. Bulganin and myself already then gave our views on this question in our meetings and talks with Messrs. Eden, Macmillan, Butler, Lloyd and other British statesmen.

I would like to say, and I hope this will not be considered an interference in your internal affairs, that although he suffered defeat in connection with the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt, Mr. Eden, it seems to us, understood the necessity for friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. In my opinion, he also understood what road should be followed to achieve this. During our stay in Britain, we talked with British statesmen about developing relations between our countries, about the necessity to develop trade, exchange various delegations, exchange scientific achievements, literature, including scientific and technical literature, and so on. We had the impression then that our statements and proposals found sympathy on the British side.

The most important factor in improving Anglo-Soviet relations is the development of trade. You British are realists. We also regard ourselves to be realists. Britain has reached a high level of development in industry, science and art thanks to her talented and industrious people. Britain to a large extent depends on trade with other countries. She is interested in the further development of trade, including that with the Soviet Union. We on our side would readily agree to this and we could be very profitable trade partners. Our country could buy from you many industrial products

which are made so well by the British. Britain could also buy from us industrial products which she needs. And what is most important, she could buy from us raw materials as her economy depends on imported raw materials. Consequently we could successfully, and with benefit to both sides, develop our relations and consolidate friendship between peoples.

But the development of Anglo-Soviet trade demands the removal of restrictions and discrimination. When we are told: you can buy this from us but you cannot buy that, this annoys us so much that we sometimes refuse to buy items which in normal conditions we would have bought. We are a proud people, and we do not want to humble ourselves, we do not want to enter a shop where they tell us we can buy one type of goods and are prohibited from buying other goods—the latter can only be bought by the NATO countries.

To this I would like to add the following. It is said that it is not possible to trade freely with the Soviet Union because one must not reveal defence industry secrets, that one must not sell the Soviet Union so-called "strategic" goods. But such arguments are groundless, as precisely for the development of our defence industry we do not need to import materials from the West. The Soviet Union made the H-bomb earlier than the U.S.A., though the Americans, helped by the British, were the first to make the A-bomb. The Soviet Union was the first, earlier than the Western countries, to develop the intercontinental ballistic missile. We were the first to launch an artificial Earth satellite. This proves that our science and technology are on a very high level, in any case, not lower than that, for instance, of Britain or the United States.

Therefore the arguments that for security reasons "strategic" materials must not be sold to the Soviet Union are completely groundless.

The policy of discrimination offends us and is a hindrance to the development of trade. This discrimination,

these artificial barriers which harm the British themselves more than anyone should be liquidated. The abolishment of discrimination would, naturally, contribute to the improvement of both economic relations and the political atmosphere not only in relations between our two countries, but also between other countries as well

Pickering. The progress of Anglo-Soviet trade has been a real disappointment to the British public. We hoped for a swifter development of this trade, and I know from personal experience, from the talks with representatives of the British Government and business circles that they consider the Soviet side shows little enthusiasm in this matter. May I ask you the following question in this connection: Is discrimination the only obstacle to the wide development of Anglo-Soviet trade?

Khrushchov. Yes, I consider it the only obstacle. There are no others. But I would like to make a small correction to what you have said just now, Mr. Pickering.

I know that in British trade circles there is a great desire for trade with us. Representatives of business circles understand that it is to their advantage, but the government circles, by certain administrative measures, hold them back. Thus it is that industrialists and business circles want to trade with the Soviet Union, yet your Government, apparently, is bound by a common agreement with NATO countries. By keeping to this agreement, the Government sacrifices the interests of the national industry and ignores the interests of the British people.

If this obstacle to the development of trade was removed—and it is necessary to eliminate it not only between Britain and the Soviet Union, but, in general, in trade relations between all countries of the East and West—it would be very useful for improving and developing international trade, for the cause of peace.

Pickering. Allow me to ask you whether purchases by the Soviet Union in Britain would also include consumer

goods and whether the quantities of consumer goods the Soviet Union could buy from Britain would be expanded.

Khrushchov: This is quite possible. We are expanding our consumer-goods industry; besides, we are buying such goods in other countries and could also buy some consumer goods in your country.

I believe our trade could be developed on such a basis the Soviet Union could buy from Britain equipment for the manufacture of certain types of consumer goods. In the agreements, provision could simultaneously be made that the firms which provided this equipment, or other British firms, would also sell us during a specified period and in agreed quantities certain manufactured consumer goods.

You, of course, understand that the Soviet Union is now a highly developed industrial country. Therefore it is not our policy to satisfy our needs in manufactured consumer goods by importing them from other countries. Our country produces such goods and will continue to expand their output still more. But the Soviet Union would quite readily buy from Britain some definite quantities of light industry goods in which we are interested. All the more so because Britain has a world reputation and if goods bear a British trade mark this is considered a guarantee of high quality.

Pickering. In a recent interview you said that the Soviet Union was planning to attain the American standard of living in about 15 years. May I ask you a question. When approximately does the Soviet Union expect to overtake the British standard of living and what can you say on this score?

Khrushchov. Excuse me, you put me in a somewhat difficult position with your question. We consider that of all the capitalist countries the United States has achieved the highest level in total production and in per capita production. That is why we have set ourselves the task, using the advantages of the socialist system, to overtake and

surpass the United States, the country with the highest level of production.

I do not have at hand the necessary data to compare our level of production with the level of production in Britain and I admit I have not thought about the problem of when our country could overtake Britain and in what categories of goods. In total output of many, one can say most, products we overlook Britain long ago, for example in the output of coal, pig iron, steel, electric power and machine building.

I suppose you have in mind per capita production and consumption. In certain types of goods per capita production and consumption in Britain are higher than in the U.S.S.R., but lower than in the United States. In the per capita output of some products we shall overtake Britain earlier than the United States. As for total production, I repeat, the level of Britain is a stage our country passed long ago.

I should like to add that in comparing levels of production and levels of consumption in our countries, we must bear in mind the following. In Britain per capita production of manufactured goods differs greatly from per capita consumption. That is understandable, for substantial quantities of British manufactured goods (and the same, although to a lesser degree, is also true of the United States) are exported all over the world, while the population consumes only a part of the goods produced. That is why the per capita production of manufactured goods in Britain and the United States is, as a rule, considerably higher than per capita consumption.

In addition, the capitalist system in Britain, the United States and other capitalist countries leads to a very unequal distribution of manufactured goods and, consequently, to unequal consumption. Thus, there is an extremely great gulf between the standard of living of people with high incomes and people with low incomes. Under socialism this

is not so. Our system guarantees considerably greater equality in the living standards of the entire people, and this must be kept in mind.

Pickering: May I now ask you about tourism? Is there any likelihood of travel in the Soviet Union being made less expensive for British tourists? I ask this because I understand you are not very satisfied about the small number of foreign tourists that visited the Soviet Union this year.

Khrushchov: I think there were artificial administrative restrictions on the part of the British Government on the number of tourists wishing to visit the Soviet Union. If these limitations are removed, I expect there will be considerably more British tourists in the Soviet Union.

This year we took steps to facilitate foreign tourism. We revised the service charges for tourists, and introduced a more advantageous ruble exchange rate against foreign currency. Thereby possibilities have been provided for tourist travel in our country at cheaper cost. If other measures are necessary, we shall look into the matter, because we want to create favourable conditions for the development of tourism.

But you must understand, we do not want to have losses from tourism. We do not seek profits from it—this would be wrong—but no government would agree to run tourist traffic at a loss. In short, we shall develop tourism.

Pickering: I understand that a number of Soviet citizens are anxious to join their relatives in Britain and the Commonwealth. Is there any chance for them to do so?

Khrushchov: I do not understand this question. As far as I know, the people of whom you speak long ago received permission to join their families. If there really are individual Soviet citizens who have relatives in Britain and the Commonwealth, their requests will surely be considered according to the existing regulations.

Pickering: I would like to ask Mr. Khrushchov if he is in favour of a strong Britain in possession of the most modern weapons for her own defence.

Khrushchov Every country has the right to take care of her security and her defence. Great Britain, as a highly developed country, has that right—like every other country.

But now the greatness of a country is determined not so much by the might and scale of its armaments, as chiefly by the development of its economy, culture and science. Peaceful economic competition, therefore, would be much more useful and safer. The more one country piles up armaments, the more the other countries strive not to lag behind in the arms race. The arms race can only lead to the exhaustion of a country's economy and even to a military conflict, which could prove fatal.

Pickering I would like to ask what you think of the prospects for peace now. In five years. In ten years. Are you an optimist or a pessimist?

Khrushchov: I have never thought of myself as a pessimist and do not consider myself one now. Pessimism stems from decline and leads to decline. Here in the Soviet Union everything is on the upgrade: our politics are on the upgrade, our economy is on the upgrade, our culture is on the upgrade. Before our very eyes what was fairy-tales and dreams is coming true: artificial satellites are circling the Earth. How then can we be pessimists? What grounds are there for it?

The successes of the Soviet Union are the work of our people, the Soviet men and women. There is also my small contribution as a Communist and a political leader.

We have always been optimists. And today we look still more optimistically into the future because we believe that reason and common sense will triumph and peace will prevail if the peoples work for it unsparingly.

Now all signs point to the fact that the prospects for peace are brightening up. I would point out that even the Prime Ministers of the North Atlantic pact countries had to open and close their speeches at the NATO Council meeting in Paris with words about peace, although some of them also indulged in sabre-rattling. If the peoples fight still more

persistently for peace, if they bring greater pressure to bear on the statesmen and politicians who do not want peaceful coexistence, peace can be ensured

We must also mention an important fact which characterizes the present international situation. Today the correlation of forces between the capitalist and socialist countries is changing before our eyes in favour of the socialist countries. The socialist countries have never contemplated, and by their very nature cannot contemplate, aggressive wars. On the contrary, they do everything possible to ensure peaceful coexistence between states. This also shows that the prospects for peace are not bad.

The absolute majority of people in the capitalist countries—I have in mind the ordinary people, the intellectuals and even many employers, representatives of business circles and statesmen—are in favour of peace. One can say that in the present international situation the tendency towards peaceful coexistence and the settling of controversial issues through negotiation, on the basis of equality and consideration of mutual interests, is growing stronger.

That is why we are optimistic about the prospects for peace. I hope you, too, share this view.

Pickering: It seems that all questions which we were going to ask you have been dealt with. Allow me to thank you for the interview.

Khrushchov: I am glad of the meeting with you because the publication of this interview in your newspaper which has many readers in Britain will promote a better understanding between our peoples, and the development of mutually advantageous trade between our countries will promote better relations between Britain and the Soviet Union.

Please tell the British people through your paper that the Soviet Union has never had any aggressive designs either against Britain or other countries no matter where they are located. We want to live in peace and friendship with Britain and all other countries.

In parting, Khrushchov said We await your Prime Minister in the Soviet Union We were guests of the British Government last year The British were very hospitable And as the saying goes, one good turn deserves another. I think that we will be no less hospitable.

Pickering. The Prime Minister will read your words in the *Daily Express*.

Pravda, December 24, 1957

**SPEECH
AT THE NINTH SESSION
OF THE U.S.S.R.
SUPREME SOVIET
(FOURTH CONVOCATION)**

December 21, 1957

Comrade Deputies, allow me to comment on some aspects of the present international situation I fully agree with Foreign Minister Comrade Gromyko's reply to the question put by a group of Supreme Soviet Deputies

In speaking of the latest major international developments, we must first mention the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the meetings of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties in Moscow.

The 40th anniversary of the Great October developed into an international demonstration of the triumph of the ideas of peace and socialism, of the achievements of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and all the socialist countries, and of their foreign policy of peace

During the anniversary celebrations meetings of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries and of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of 64 countries were held in Moscow. These meetings adopted historic documents—the Declaration and Peace Manifesto.

As noted in the resolution of the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of our Party on the results of these meetings, they convincingly demonstrated the further consolidation of the socialist camp and of the international com-

munist movement as a whole on the ideological basis of Marxism-Leninism. The main results of the meetings were the elaboration and proclamation of the basic tasks of the Communists in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism at the present stage of world history, the consolidation of the international communist movement and the further strengthening of ties between the fraternal parties. The historic importance of these meetings is that they signify a major ideological and political victory for the world communist and working-class movement, the triumph of the principles of proletarian internationalism. The results of these meetings, which were marked by a comradely and cordial atmosphere, delivered a crushing blow to the plans of imperialist reaction which has tried hard of late to split the international communist movement.

The warm approval of the documents adopted at the meetings—the Declaration and the Peace Manifesto—by millions of Communists and the broad masses of the working people throughout the world spells the collapse of the hopes of the imperialists and their servitors for a “crisis” in the world communist movement.

The Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers’ parties of the socialist countries is a model of creative Marxism-Leninism based on a generalization of the collective experience of the Communist parties of the socialist and capitalist countries.

The Peace Manifesto, adopted by the meeting of all the Communist and Workers’ parties, is of great historic importance in the struggle for world peace. As you know, a delegation from the League of Communists of Yugoslavia attended this meeting and approved the Peace Manifesto. This is another step towards still closer contact between the Yugoslav Communists and our Party and the other Communist and Workers’ parties. The Yugoslav League of Communists did not take part, however, in the meeting of the fraternal parties of the socialist countries and did not sign the Declaration. Is this a negative thing? It is, because it shows that

there still are differences on some ideological and political points between the League and the other Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries. It is clear, though, that these differences are fewer than in the past. On many vital issues the Yugoslav Communists side with all the Communist and Workers' parties. We shall continue to pursue the policy of friendship and cooperation with the fraternal peoples of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, strive for better relations with the League of Communists on the basis of the granite principles of Marxism-Leninism, and overcome the ideological and political differences that still exist.

The documents commend the working class of our country, which was the first to carry out, under the leadership of its militant vanguard, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a victorious socialist revolution and which has won historic success in the struggle for communism. (*Stormy applause*)

It is not fortuitous that the enemies of socialism have always concentrated their fire on all the Communist parties, particularly on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The working class of our country and our Communist Party have set examples of revolutionary struggle against the exploiters, for the interests of the working class, of the working people in general, for the triumph of socialism. That is why the enemies seek to minimize the Soviet Union's role in the revolutionary movement, try to discredit it. But so far they have not succeeded in doing this, and they never will. (*Applause*) They are intent on dividing the efforts of the revolutionary Communist and Workers' parties, on splitting the unity of the socialist countries. They are seeking to set one socialist country against another, and weaken the solidarity of the revolutionary forces.

The imperialists try to cloak their treacherous design to split the unity of the socialist countries by pleading concern for the "independence" of this or that country. In crusading against the unity of the socialist countries, they de-

pict themselves almost as champions of the independence and sovereignty of this or that state. But when they speak of the need to unite the capitalist countries in military blocs, they demand from their partners renunciation of sovereignty in the name of this union, claiming there is no such thing as absolute sovereignty, that it is an anachronism.

We must continue to be on the alert, we should not let ourselves be deflected, and firmly and consistently pursue a policy that would further the solidarity of the countries of the socialist camp and promote their unity. We must pursue our policy of peace, the policy of strengthening cooperation and friendly relations among all countries on the basis of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence

The results of the meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties testify to the utter futility of the designs of imperialist reaction to split the socialist countries and weaken their unity, to undermine the Soviet Union's prestige and to weaken the bonds between the fraternal parties and the Communist Party of our country. The meetings reaffirmed the deep sympathies which all the fraternal parties entertain for our Party and the peoples of the Soviet Union. Even inveterate enemies of the U.S.S.R. are now compelled to admit the Soviet Union's unshakeable prestige in the eyes of the working people of the world, and the profound trust which the fraternal parties repose in our Communist Party. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The best way the Communists and all the Soviet people can respond to this trust is to work selflessly to build communist society, further enhance the might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, fight without let-up for world peace and closer friendship with the working people and democratic forces of the world (*Stormy applause.*)

We are grateful to all our friends for their trust and their recognition of the services of our Party and our people. We say to all our friends and comrades that we are every bit as young and eager now in the fight for communism as we

were at the time of the Great October, in the days we were battling on the fronts of the Civil War and on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War. (*Stormy applause*)

We have retained our great revolutionary ardour and assure our comrades in the struggle for the working-class cause that we shall always be loyal to Marxism-Leninism, to proletarian internationalism, that we shall continue to regard ourselves as the vanguard which unfurled the banner of Lenin and, headed by Lenin, was the first to make the assault against capitalism, and which has held aloft this banner for forty years (*Stormy applause.*)

We shall hold the banner of Lenin firmly in our hands, march on confidently to the triumph of communism, and tenaciously uphold world peace—this we pledge. (*Stormy applause.*)

Comrades, the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and all the socialist countries consistently pursue the line of easing international tension, stopping the cold war and the arms drive, ensuring durable world peace based on the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems. This policy derives from the essence of the foreign policy of the socialist states. It has the backing of many European and, particularly, Afro-Asian countries. The popular movement for peace is gathering momentum in the capitalist countries.

Nor can one fail to notice that more and more people are now calling for an end to the cold war policy and the arms drive, for international relations based on peaceful coexistence.

We salute such outstanding statesmen as Prime Minister Nehru of India, President Sukarno of Indonesia, Prime Minister U Nu of Burma, President Nasser of Egypt, President Kuwatly of Syria and others who are working hard for peace. (*Prolonged applause*)

The cold war policy is being criticized by people in different walks of life, in the different strata of society—people of the free professions, businessmen and politicians. The need

for a more realistic assessment of the international balance of forces has been suggested lately by such diverse public personalities as Smith, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, the British philosopher Bertrand Russell, Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Eaton, an industrialist, Hearst, newspaper magnate, and many other personalities and statesmen in the capitalist world.

The peace-loving peoples welcome these statements because they realize what war would mean under modern conditions.

Yet the rulers of the imperialist states obstinately persist in aggravating relations between the countries, in further extending and reinforcing aggressive military blocs, and in prosecuting the arms drive. Ignoring the interests of the peoples, they refuse to abandon their aggressive foreign policy. They do the bidding of the small but influential handful of monopolists who are intent on stoking the embers of the cold war with a view to its breaking out at some time into a hot war. What do they care about the interests of the peoples! The destiny of mankind is the least of their concerns. They are actuated by the lust for enrichment at the expense of the pain and torment of the ordinary people. The imperialists' motto is: The worse it is for peace the better it is for making money. The climate of anxiety and alarm, and the fears of the people about a possible atomic war—these are the conditions which make it easier for the imperialists to realize their designs and extract money from the taxpayer for armament.

The peoples have had their fill of the war psychosis, of the nervous tension, of the tax burden which weighs heavily, above all on the workingman. If the cost of the armaments in all countries were calculated, the people would be horrified at the waste of so much of the national wealth, given other conditions these resources could be devoted to raising living standards, to expanding the economy and culture.

The matter stands thus: if we are to have peace and a peaceful settlement of controversial issues, and not atomic war, which is fraught with catastrophic consequences, the imperialists will have to abandon the cold war policy and arms drive and their hopes of changing the world by force for the benefit of the monopolies. As a matter of fact, the entire sense of the "positions of strength" policy is to compel the Soviet Union to accept Western ultimatum-like demands and "settle" certain political issues in the interests of the imperialists.

The Western powers are keen, for instance, "on settling" the problem of the People's Democracies. But what does this imply? By meddling in the internal affairs of these countries, contrary to the will of the peoples, they want to abolish the socialist gains of the working people and restore capitalist and landlord rule. They also talk a great deal about "settling" the German question. But how do they conceive this "settlement"? They would like to unify Germany by joining East Germany to West Germany, that is by abolishing the socialist gains of the German Democratic Republic and adding to the military economic potential of West Germany, and then to bring this unified Germany into the aggressive North-Atlantic bloc. As you see, they expect us to agree to the strengthening of German militarism and revanchism.

In what way does this "settlement" of political problems differ from a *diktat*, from a policy of ultimatums? As far as the Soviet Union is concerned this policy has never had success in the past and has even fainter chance of success now. (*Prolonged applause.*)

To the representatives of the Western countries, and primarily the United States, we say—throw your unreasonable and sufficiently discredited "positions of strength" policy into the garbage heap of history. That is where it belongs. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Let us settle outstanding issues by peaceful negotiation and soberly, without *diktat*, discuss on an equal footing the

problems agitating mankind, let us rule out war as a means for solving international problems, let us recognize the status quo, that is, the present world situation with its co-existing socialist and capitalist countries, let us not interfere in one another's internal affairs

We declare that however acute the ideological differences between the two systems—the socialist and the capitalist—may be, controversial issues should be solved not by war, but by negotiation. We suggest that competition in inventing new weapons be replaced by peaceful competition. The victory of a social system will be decided not by rockets, not by atomic and hydrogen bombs, but by the system that provides man with greater material and spiritual benefits. We hold that socialism is a better system of society. So let one of the two social systems prove its superiority not in war but in peace, in expanding the productive forces of society, science, technology and culture, in providing better living conditions for man. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Tell me, what of this is unacceptable to any country, no matter what its system? The thing is that the more aggressive imperialist quarters in the West do not want to end the cold war and seek all kinds of pretexts to continue it. They try to intimidate the U.S.S.R. and the other peace-loving countries, calculating that they will be able to force the Soviet Union to invest more money in war industry and thus prevent it from increasing the output of consumer goods.

That is how matters stand. The imperialists dread peaceful competition with the socialist system more than anything else.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are not threatening anyone with war, they do not contemplate imposing their way of thinking and acting on anyone. That which they offer to the nations is peace and friendship. (*Applause*) We want to achieve mutual understanding, to establish confidence between the countries, to put an end to the fanning of war passions and bring about tranquillity, to give people the opportunity to work in peace.

This, it would seem, is clear. But they say that it is propaganda. Yes, it is propaganda, but propaganda not of war but of peace, because in the Soviet Union, in contrast to the United States, for instance, advocacy of war is regarded as a grave crime, punishable by law. What is wrong with propaganda advocating peace? We are ready to hear this propaganda from the Western powers every day and every hour. Instead, day after day, from Western official spokesmen, generals and admirals come calls for war, bellicose statements to the effect that modern weapons can "destroy the Soviet Union," "raze to the ground" our cities and industrial centres.

When they want to say something derogatory, insulting in relation to the peace-loving steps of the Soviet Union, they invoke the word "propaganda." The whole point is, however, that in resorting to this trick they want to evade the issue for the simple reason that, apart from a bellicose aggressive policy, they have nothing with which to counter the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

During the past few days the attention of the world has been focused on the messages of the Government of the Soviet Union to the governments of the United States, Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Turkey, Norway, Denmark, the governments of the other NATO member-countries, as well as to the governments of all UN member-states. The latest peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union has won the support and approval of all those who cherish peace and the security of the nations.

As you know, the Soviet Government declared that it was ready, as from January 1, 1958, to refrain from exploding nuclear weapons, provided the United States and Britain undertook to do likewise. The Soviet Union suggested that the United States and Britain, which possess atomic and hydrogen weapons, should renounce their use. It suggested that all military blocs be dissolved and replaced by a system of collective security in Europe and Asia, or, at least, a non-

aggression treaty be concluded between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty member-states. We believe that at the present time perfectly real conditions exist for creating in Europe a zone in which there would be neither atomic nor hydrogen weapons.

We have suggested normalizing the situation in the Near and Middle East, a Soviet-American friendship treaty, steps to end war propaganda, extending trade, scientific, cultural and sports contacts. We have proposed that discrimination and restrictions be discarded, that relations between the countries be based on mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-intervention in each other's internal affairs for political, economic or ideological considerations, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.

These are our proposals. They are prompted by the sincere desire of the Soviet Government to safeguard and consolidate peace. Our peace policy is by no means prompted by weakness. It will not be amiss to recall that only a few years ago Western spokesmen indulged in allegations to the effect that the peace policy of the Soviet Union and its proposals for easing international tension were prompted by economic weakness and technical backwardness. Hence, they concluded, pressure should be brought to bear on the Soviet Union, to compel it, under threat of force, to make political concessions and, if possible, even to renounce its ideology. Everybody knows how these plans ended.

And speculations on weakness of the Soviet Union and attempts to dictate to it are every bit as silly and futile now as they were in the past.

That our country is now in its prime is plain for all to see; who can doubt now that the Soviet Union, the countries of the socialist camp, all the progressive forces, have the powerful means that can put a curb on anyone itching for military gambles. Even the leaders of the United States and the other Western countries are now compelled to admit that the Soviet Union has made tremendous progress

in developing its economy and culture, and that its might is growing daily.

We have pursued and are pursuing our peace policy because it stems from the most peace-loving and most humane of all social systems—socialism.

Who does not know that the Soviet Union has more than once given practical proof of its peaceful intentions and its desire to ease international tension?

Much time would be needed to enumerate even the more important constructive and fully acceptable proposals advanced in recent times by the Soviet Government for the consideration of the United Nations or individual Western countries. And how many peaceful proposals have been made by people's China and other socialist countries! If these steps had not encountered bitter opposition on the part of the imperialist circles in the West, primarily the United States, had they been considered soberly, impartially and realistically, the cold war would have long been a thing of the past and tangible results would have been achieved in relaxing international tension.

Take disarmament. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated its attitude on the problems of disarmament, its proposals have been aimed at unfreezing and ending, at last, the deadlock, which, more than anything else, worries mankind.

The Soviet Union stands as hitherto for a radical solution of the disarmament problem; it advocates complete and unconditional prohibition of A- and H-weapons, their removal from national armaments, the destruction of existing stockpiles of these weapons, a substantial reduction of armed forces, armaments and military expenditure with the proper international control.

Thus, we, for our part, have suggested the most radical measures. We have expended no little effort in trying to reach agreement with the Western powers on disarmament. Unfortunately we failed to reach agreement owing to the Western attitude at the London talks which took place in an

utterly abnormal atmosphere. How can one regard as normal the fact that in the UN Disarmament Sub-Committee the Soviet Union found itself faced with four NATO member-countries whose representatives turned down every Soviet proposal on disarmament. Acting in this manner the Western representatives deluded the public, giving the impression that talks were under way and that some kind of progress had been made.

For perfectly understandable reasons this situation could no longer be tolerated. So at the recent UN General Assembly session the Soviet Government proposed setting up a disarmament committee that would consist of all UN members. But under Western pressure this proposal, too, was turned down.

The motion advanced by the Delegation of the Albanian People's Republic for a narrower disarmament committee in which at least half the members would represent the socialist and neutral countries was also rejected. This was a rational proposal, but, unfortunately, it failed to find understanding and support. Then, under U.S. pressure, a new committee was set up. Though it was somewhat larger, the balance of forces was the same as in the old Sub-Committee. Furthermore, the Western powers pushed through a resolution setting out in advance the policy they considered acceptable and which was in the nature of an ultimatum to the peace-loving states. Is it possible to describe as realistic a policy designed to force the will of one group of countries on others, which tramples underfoot the basic principles of the United Nations and undermines its foundations?

The United Nations was brought into being for the purpose of resolving controversial issues peacefully, so that its decisions should take into account the interests of all member-countries and be acceptable to them. Yet, the above-mentioned resolution is in the nature of a *diktat* and leads to discrimination against a number of peaceful countries. The Soviet Union declared that, in view of the situation, it would not take part in a committee where the vast majority

of seats are held by countries belonging to aggressive military blocs. What can this committee do when the other side is absent? Its work will be sterile and doomed to failure.

The Soviet Union will continue to press for reasonable agreements on disarmament, which is the burning question of the day. But if positive results are to be achieved the deliberate attempts to make disarmament settlement conditional on a settlement of political issues such as the German question, which is what the Western powers have been doing, must be abandoned.

The Soviet Union has suggested a conference of the Heads of Government of the socialist and capitalist countries to discuss in a businesslike way and on an equal footing the issues that have long agitated mankind, including disarmament, and to find mutually acceptable solutions. The conference could, in our view, be preceded by a meeting of representatives of the two strongest powers, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. It can hardly be doubted that if agreement were reached between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union, without, of course, any detriment to other countries, the situation in the world would change considerably for the better.

We have always held and continue to hold that positive results could be achieved at a meeting of representatives of the socialist and capitalist countries. What is needed for this? Firstly, no discussion at such a conference of the points which divide the sides ideologically, no discussion of the ways of development in the socialist and capitalist countries. Let the peoples themselves decide these matters. Secondly, it is necessary to recognize the fact of the existence of both socialist and capitalist countries, not to interfere in each other's affairs, not to resort to cold war methods, to renounce attempts to change the existing situation by force. But should the Western powers proceed from the assumption that only the capitalist system exists, and ignore the socialist countries, then, of course, it will be impossible to find a basis for mutual understanding.

Let the Western powers but recognize the status quo and it will be possible to go ahead with the meeting and it will then be easy to reach agreement on a multitude of questions and pave the way to normal relations between the countries, to a peaceful and tranquil life for the people.

But we are told. It is pointless to have a meeting with the Soviet Union since it is intransigent and "tough" and, in the event of reaching agreement on any issue, will not honour its word and fulfil its obligations. These allegations are absolutely groundless

We could afford to ignore these things were it not for the fact that in recent times some official personages in the West have taken it upon themselves to misinform world public opinion. Thus, Mr Dulles, and after him Herr Adenauer, claimed recently that agreement had been reached at the Geneva Heads of Government meeting on the German unification and that the Soviet Union had not abided by the decisions. This allegation does not conform to reality and contradicts the facts. It is surprising that the communiqué of the last NATO Council session repeated Mr Dulles' false version.

What, exactly, did the Heads of Government agree upon at Geneva and what was the attitude of the Soviet Government?

The directives of the four Heads of Government to their foreign ministers said that "the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security."

Furthermore, the statement made by the Soviet delegation at the final meeting emphasized that the Soviet Government assumed that any settlement of the German question would take cognizance of the facts, that is, would consider the existence of two German states, the Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic, that a mechanical merger was out of the question, that the German problem could not

be solved without the representatives of the two German states.

Finally, at a meeting in Berlin immediately after the Geneva conference it was stated that the approach should be "a German settlement by the Germans themselves, who, undoubtedly, can choose the right road for Germany's development."

Such is the standpoint of the Soviet Government, which was upheld by our delegation at the Geneva conference of the four Heads of Government. It was reaffirmed at the subsequent meeting of the Foreign Ministers at which the Soviet representative again emphasized that the question of Germany should be decided by the Germans themselves.

That is still our position. What grounds, then, has Mr. Dulles for saying that the Soviet Union does not honour its commitments? The groundlessness of his statements was so glaring that even the bourgeois press had to expose them.

Here, for example, is what the British commentator Scott, with Mr. Dulles' statement in mind, wrote in the December 6 issue of the *Manchester Guardian*.

"Mr. Dulles is in danger of creating for himself the reputation of a professional anti-Soviet, someone to whom every action by the Soviet Government appears suspect or worse by reason of its origin rather than its nature. That is a reputation which no one who is responsible for America's foreign relations can afford. As long as it is necessary and possible to maintain relations with the Russians, it is useless to leave the responsibility for their conduct in the hands of someone who is openly predisposed to mistrust the Soviet Government and, therefore, to doubt the value of trying to negotiate with it. But this is exactly the attitude that Mr. Dulles appears to hold.

"In an interview with a B.B.C. correspondent in Washington on Tuesday, Mr. Dulles claimed that the Russians were the first nation to turn treaty-breaking into a regular, accepted means of gaining their own ends. After taking part in twelve conferences with the Russians, he thought very

little of value had emerged from such conferences 'primarily because the Soviet cannot be relied on to live up to their promises.' In support of this very sweeping assertion Mr. Dulles referred to the Summit Conference in Geneva in July 1955. He claimed that an agreement had been reached at that conference that Germany should be reunified through free elections, and that this agreement had been torn up by the Russians 'almost within weeks' of having been made."

"This is the sort of shadowy half-truth," Scott continues, "which the Russians use so effectively in their own propaganda, and which sometimes causes less professional anti-Soviets than Mr. Dulles to despair of Soviet good faith. The fact that last night's Anglo-German communiqué also complains that the Soviet Government had not yet fulfilled its 'obligation' to reunify Germany through free elections does not make it any less—or is it more?—of a half-truth. All that was ever agreed at the Geneva Summit Conference was a directive by the four Heads of Government to their Foreign Ministers to guide them in their future talks . . ."

After citing the directive, commentator Scott stressed that it contained nothing to the effect that the Soviet Government had committed itself to free elections in Germany, irrespective of what may or may not have been agreed on as regards other related matters. "And those who attended that Summit Conference," Scott declared, "will remember that the central difference between the Russian and the Western delegations was precisely over the question as to which should come first—German unity or European security. In the end both sides had to agree that the two problems were directly linked, and the wording of the directive in fact makes this quite clear."

It is highly characteristic that this is not the only comment on Dulles' statements. Crankshaw, another British commentator, a man with no special sympathies for the Soviet Union, wrote in *The Observer* on December 8:

"Now apart from the fact that the duty of a Foreign Secretary is to plug away at negotiation (if he feels unable to

fulfil this duty, then his next duty is to resign), this simply is not true. The Russians do not freely break agreements. . . No such agreement was made at Geneva, as everybody knows."

Such, then, is the worth of Mr. Dulles' statements! How can such groundless statements contribute to international confidence, to a correct approach to the solution of international issues?

Comrades, the declaration and communiqué of the NATO Council session, which was attended by the Heads of Government of the member-states, have just been made public. Judging by the foreign press, one should note first of all that, under public pressure, the Soviet Government's messages were included on the agenda of the NATO session. The positive response by some Western Heads of Government to the suggestion made in the Soviet Government's messages for a summit meeting to discuss urgent international matters is to be welcomed. Characteristically, many leaders of the Western delegations had to begin and end their speeches with words of peace.

And even in the documents adopted by the NATO session much is said about peace. Thus the declaration states:

"Faithful to the Charter of the United Nations, we reaffirm that our alliance will never be used for aggressive purposes. We are always ready to settle international problems by negotiation, taking into account the legitimate interests of all. We seek an end to world tension and intend to promote peace, economic prosperity and social progress throughout the world." Pretty well said!

"We continue," the declaration points out, "firmly to stand for comprehensive and controlled disarmament which we believe can be reached by stages. In spite of disappointments we remain ready to discuss any reasonable proposal to reach this goal and to lay a solid foundation for a durable peace. This is the only way to dispel the anxieties arising from the armaments race."

And we, the Soviet Union, are ready to subscribe to such statements about peace and disarmament. Why shouldn't the member-states of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty draw up a common non-aggression declaration? Why not pledge to stop calling for war, to end the cold war and the arms drive, do away with restrictions and discrimination in trade, and promote relations in science, culture and sports?

That would be an excellent beginning, one that would accord with the interests of all the peace-loving peoples (*Prolonged applause*)

The Heads of Government of the North Atlantic bloc countries declared that they had gathered in Paris with no aggressive intent, that NATO as such, and each country separately, did not want war, that they wanted peace, and were merely taking measures to defend themselves from possible aggression. But since no one threatens the Western powers with aggression, the situation surely favours easing international tension and consolidating peace.

But, of necessity, one notes that alongside words about the desire for peace and disarmament, the NATO session documents also contain pronouncements which refute the peace-loving statements. Apparently, the NATO organizers found it quite hard to draft the declaration and the communiqué, since they had a pretty difficult task. Confronted with the demand of all the peace-loving peoples to end the cold war and the arms drive, they had to include words of peace. But those are so heavily interlarded with reservations, conditions and demands that virtually nothing remains of these correct provisions. What it comes down to is the same old course of stoking the cold war and the arms drive.

If the Heads of Government of the NATO countries are sincerely desirous of peace, they will meet with the full understanding and support of the Soviet Union and all the peace-loving states, which deem it their sacred duty to strengthen peace and international security. If each honestly strives for peace, war will be ruled out as a means of resolving controversial international issues. (*Applause*)

It is our hope that the forces of peace and the resolve of the peoples against the danger of another war will gain the upper hand over the forces of war. The peoples will achieve their goal and ultimately compel the governments to seek solutions through peaceful coexistence. (*Applause*)

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue to work to end the cold war and the arms drive, to establish confidence among states and wider friendly cooperation. But time, obviously, will be needed to establish these relations.

Nor can the fact be ignored that the burden of military expenditures weighs heavily on the masses, and the interests of improving conditions for millions of people necessitate urgent measures to end the arms drive. In the event of the NATO countries abiding by their peace statements, the Soviet Union will take, as it has already done more than once, unilateral steps to further reduce its armed forces and military expenditure and will channel the released means and manpower into civilian construction, into raising the standard of living of the Soviet people. (*Prolonged applause*)

We, however, are realists in policy, and we cannot but reckon with the fact that the communiqué of the NATO Council session contains statements completely out of joint with words about peace. The decision to place ballistic missiles at the disposal of the NATO Supreme Commander, to stockpile nuclear warheads and establish atomic bases and rocket-launching grounds in West European countries directly jeopardizes peace. Taking this into consideration, the Soviet Union will work to strengthen its defences, and develop the necessary means for a crushing retaliation, should the imperialists unleash another war. (*Stormy applause.*)

We make no bones about the fact that if agreement is not reached on disarmament, the Soviet Union will give due attention to developing the latest types of weapons. But it will do this rationally so as not to overburden our budget, our economy and our people by heavy expenditure.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly declared that it is imperative to stop the arms drive and outlaw mass destruction weapons. The latest types of weapons are so powerful that their use in a war would imperil the existence of entire countries. But if war is unleashed, massive retaliatory blows will be struck at countries in which there are NATO war bases and those now building these bases for aggressive purposes. There is not a place in the world in which the aggressor could hide from just retribution.

Hence, we cannot but welcome the sober statements made by Messrs Gerhardsen and Hansen, the Prime Ministers of Norway and of Denmark. Considerate of the national interests of their peoples, they refused to have rocket and nuclear weapons deployed in their countries. We cannot but point to the grim consequences that may ensue from the consent of the governments of some European states to have atomic bases and rocket-launching grounds in their countries.

We are somewhat astonished at the bellicose ardour of Italian and Turkish statesmen. They advocate nuclear armament and the establishment of rocket bases in their countries. This is incomprehensible. Geographically, Italy is in a position where she actually cannot use ballistic or other rockets without violating the neutrality of the countries between Italy and the Soviet Union. As we know, ballistic rockets can fly only in a straight line. We know, too, that the war bases and rocket-launching grounds are spear-headed against the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving states.

These rockets cannot be fired against the Soviet Union from Italian bases without violating the sovereignty of Austria and Yugoslavia. Without question, the peace-loving peoples will raise their voices against this danger.

The attitude taken by the leaders of Turkey, a neighbour of ours, is a cause for regret. The presence of atomic bases and rocket-launching grounds on Turkish territory threatens her civilian population with the danger of disaster.

Evidently the bellicose Turkish leaders do not understand sufficiently just how hot the objects of their desires are. They forget that they are liable to burn their fingers. (*Prolonged applause.*)

This also goes for the other countries whose leaders agree to have military bases on their territory.

We hope that common sense will prevail, and that the leaders taking upon themselves the grave responsibility for establishing military bases in their countries will come to their senses in good time and not let themselves be involved in dangerous ventures.

It should be clear to everyone that atomic bases and rocket-launching grounds will become targets in the event of a military conflict and will be subjected to devastating retaliatory blows. We have no desire whatever to intimidate anyone. We say this only to warn against the grave danger that overshadows the countries which are being turned into war bases at the will of the engineers of aggressive military blocs. This matter is not a trifling one.

Establishing military bases on foreign territories, the leaders of the Western states, and first and foremost the United States, try to convince people that the bases are intended to safeguard their security. But this is a lie. In reality modern war bases inevitably threaten the civilian population of entire countries with the danger of annihilation. The gravity of the danger can be judged by the fact that a considerable number of American bombers carrying A- and H-bombs engage in round the clock patrol in the skies above the countries in which U.S. air-force bases are located.

Imagine what would happen if one of these pilots, not because of ill-will, but owing to a blackout or because he had misunderstood his orders, were to drop this lethal load on the territory of a country. Then, in accordance with the logic of war, an immediate retaliatory blow would follow. A world war could break out in this way.

We can also imagine another case: during "defence" patrol over the territory where the air bases are located,

the plane has an accident or technical mishap, and this is perfectly possible no matter how good the machine may be. The lethal load drops on the civilian population of the country which these planes are supposed to protect. This may result in the death of millions

So you see, atomic bases, built on the pretext of safeguarding the security of nations, actually constitute, daily and hourly, a mortal danger to the nations. Are the people of the countries where the war bases are located aware or do they feel that they may become the first A- or H-bomb victims even in peace-time?

They should wake up before it is too late and call to order those who gamble with their future. Society must find the strength with which to curb in time the war adventurers.

The organizers of the imperialist aggressive blocs try to camouflage their real designs by shouting about the "menace" of international communism, about its hankering for world dominion.

Thus the NATO session declaration without any grounds whatever asserted that "the Communist rulers again gave clear warning of their determination to press on to domination over the entire world, if possible by subversion, if necessary by violence."

This is a familiar trick. During decades of courageous struggle for the interests of the working people, the Communists have often had to listen to these utterly groundless assertions. But the Communists, stepping out along their own road, are marching from victory to victory. They are inspired by the noble ideas of scientific communism which expresses the fundamental interests of the working class, of all working people. That is why the Communists have no need to impose their ideas by force. Theirs are the most progressive ideas of our epoch, they are found wherever people live. These ideas cannot be destroyed just as the people cannot be destroyed. (*Stormy applause*)

The march of history is inexorable. It cannot be halted by any reactionary forces. If they try to do this by force of

arms and unleash a war, they will dig their own grave. The peoples will no longer stand for a system that brings war, suffering and privation to mankind.

The only way out, then, is to have peaceful coexistence between the two systems and peaceful competition.

The idea of peaceful coexistence among countries differing in social systems is unanimously approved by all the peace-loving peoples. It found support at the recent session of the UN General Assembly which urged all countries "to devote their efforts to strengthening international peace, to extending friendly relations and cooperation, and also to peaceful settlement of disputes." Thus, the principles of peaceful coexistence have been approved by the representatives of most of the countries of the world.

The NATO communiqué says that the participants reviewed the Middle East situation and declared their support for the independence and sovereignty of the countries in this part of the world. But they lacked the courage to condemn the aggression against Egypt by Britain, France and Israel, the first two of which belong to the North-Atlantic Alliance. What weight, then, can be attached to such words as "independence" and "sovereignty" if just slightly over a year ago the blood of the valiant Egyptians was made to flow? This aggression, which threatened to develop into a world war, was curbed only through the intervention of the peace-loving states, including the Soviet Union (*Applause.*)

Some of the arms drive advocates bluntly claim that a reduction in war orders would entail serious economic complications, curtailed production and unemployment. Only those who are indifferent to the destinies of the nations can think in this way.

Are the interests of a handful of monopolists to be placed above the interests of entire nations? Are they to prosper at the expense of the suffering of millions? Cannot the vast productive capacities of the capitalist countries be used to produce civilian goods to satisfy the daily needs? Are not millions living in poverty and privation in the United

States? Does not it have slums and masses of homeless people? The picture is the same in any capitalist country. Cannot the thousands of millions squandered on armaments be used to expand civilian economy, to raise living standards and give economic aid to the underdeveloped nations who are poor precisely because the imperialists have plundered them for centuries? (*Applause*)

If restrictions and discrimination were abolished, if the trade barriers between East and West were pulled down, the United States, Britain, France and West Germany would have wide opportunities to market their civilian goods. This would help raise the standard of living in all countries. Extension of trade, based on mutual benefit, development of scientific, cultural and sports contacts would bring the peoples closer together, further cooperation between them on the principles of peaceful coexistence

In assessing the present international situation it should be said that favourable conditions are now emerging for the consolidation of peace.

The peoples of the Soviet Union will continue to uphold peace without stinting their efforts, will strengthen international friendship, adhering the while to the grand principles of the peace-loving Leninist foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government. (*Prolonged applause.*)

* * *

Comrade Deputies, the year 1957 is drawing to a close. We are on the brink of the new year of 1958. The year 1957 was a good year! And I think that 1958 will be even better! (*Prolonged applause*)

The outgoing year brought the peoples of the Soviet Union great success in industry, in agriculture, in raising cultural and living standards, brilliant achievements in science and engineering, successes in strengthening the international position of our country and in further enhancing its prestige. It was distinguished by the truly historic

feat of our glorious scientists, engineers, technicians and workers who made the world's first artificial Earth satellites now revolving around our planet. The sputniks glorify the successes of our people, the triumph of the ideas of socialism, herald the progress of Soviet science and engineering. The year 1957 will go down in the annals as the year when progressive mankind celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, as the year of the rallying of the forces of the world communist movement and of its outstanding victories, as the year of a further weakening of international imperialism and reaction.

Entering upon the new year of 1958 we have every faith in our future. This year the attention of the Communist Party and all the Soviet people will be concentrated on the sweeping plans for building communism, plans worked out in keeping with the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Party. The great Lenin described our Party as a party of pathfinders, because the new communist society is being established under its leadership. The recent Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Party discussed the results of the meeting of fraternal Communist and Workers' parties and the work of the Soviet trade unions. The present session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has discussed and endorsed the State Plan and State Budget for 1958. The Central Committee Plenary Meeting and the Supreme Soviet session have adopted important decisions the implementation of which will ensure a further upsurge in all branches of the national economy, the raising of cultural and living standards, release of the initiative and activity of the masses of the working people (*Prolonged applause*)

We welcome the incoming year full of hope that it will bring the Soviet people, the people of builders and creators, fresh success in building communist society (*Stormy applause.*)

We shall do everything to make 1958 a year of peace, a year in which the cold war will subside or be completely

abolished, so that the people can live without worry for their future, for the future of their children, wives and mothers, so that competition between the two systems can develop peacefully, on the basis of economic and cultural advancement and fuller satisfaction of man's material and spiritual requirements. (*Prolonged applause*)

The Soviet people are engaged in peaceful labour. To strengthen the cause of peace they will strive wholeheartedly to fulfil the plans adopted at the session, to enhance the might of the Soviet state and raise the standard of living of the working people.

Let us wish all our people success in their creative labour for the good of our great socialist country, let us wish every family and every citizen of the Soviet Union a happy new year! (*Stormy applause*)

Glory to the great Soviet people, the builders of communism, and to their tried and tested leader, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union! (*Stormy applause.*)

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, beneath the banner of Marxism-Leninism—forward along the road of building communism! (*Stormy, prolonged applause All rise.*)

FOR PEACE AND HAPPINESS OF NATIONS!

*To Readers of the Journal
"Soviet-Chinese Friendship"*

Dear comrades and friends, the Society for Soviet-Chinese friendship marked New Year's Day with the publication of the first issue of its journal, which is called upon to serve the cause of further strengthening fraternal friendship between our peoples. I think that this is a good and useful undertaking. In greeting the readers of the journal *Soviet-Chinese Friendship*, I and all Soviet friends of China express the confidence that 1958 will witness a still more powerful unity of the great peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic to the joy of all builders of socialism and advocates of peace and to the terror of our enemies.

The indestructible friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic, the unity and solidarity of the camp of socialism and the close unity of the fighters for peace, democracy and socialism throughout the world are a stronghold which no force can overpower.

Allow me on this New Year's Day to wish you further successes in the building of socialism, in the struggle for peace and the happiness of nations.

Let the fraternal friendship between the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union live forever.

Happy New Year and may it bring you further triumphs!

N. KHRUSHCHOV

December 30, 1957
Prauda, January 1, 1958